

CA24N
DE
- 051



Ministry
of
Education

Ontario Career Action Program in Industry



1977-78 Evaluation Report

ONTARIO CAREER ACTION PROGRAM IN-INDUSTRY

1977-78

EVALUATION REPORT

March 1979

Dr. Bette Stephenson, Minister
Dr. H.K. Fisher, Deputy Minister

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	(iv)
Highlights	(v)
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY	1
ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION	3
PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION	4
PERCEPTIONS OF THE TRAINEES AND THEIR SUPERVISORS	6
1. Input	7
2. Work Experience Component	13
3. Job-Search/Career Counselling Component	16
4. Output	28
5. Program Effectiveness	38
EMPLOYERS PARTICIPATION IN OCAP	40
RECOMMENDATIONS	52
APPENDIX	
1. Trainee Questionnaire Responses	53
2. Supervisor Questionnaire	64
3. Employer Questionnaire	68

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

PREFACE

Those who work directly with OCAP and those who have studied the program, have long recognized the vital needs it serves. This evaluation supports those efforts and commitments.

Though researched and written by persons closely connected with the program, every effort has been made to ensure objectivity and fairness. In this regard, consideration is offered to those whose assistance was critical to this evaluation, especially Ed Cheung, G.L. Oliver and Michael Sinclair.

D.C. Ahrens

OCAP Manager

W.B. Fields

Research and Program

Co-ordinator

March 1979

HIGHLIGHTS

Applicants

1. More than 16,000 applications from unemployed youth were submitted for consideration in OCAP-in-Industry in 1977-78.
2. Applications were received from all areas of the Province, on a reasonably well distributed basis.
3. Over 10,000 employers from all parts of Ontario enquired about participation in the program.
4. Over 1,000 employers sponsored a trainee in the OCAP-training process.
5. Almost 1,600 unemployed youth engaged in OCAP training.

Training Positions

6. Training positions were reasonably distributed across the Province (see Table 1), though Metropolitan Toronto had disproportionately fewer positions because of the concentration of Ministry training positions available in the OCAP-in-Government program.
7. All training positions were with business and industry in the private sector.
8. Eighty percent of the participating companies had fewer than 25 employees.

Work Experience

9. Seventy-nine percent of the trainees were placed in training stations of their occupational choice.
10. Seventy-seven percent of the trainees perceived their OCAP work experience as valuable.
11. Eighty-four percent of the trainees thought that their job skills had improved during their OCAP training period.
12. Eighty-three percent of the supervisors stated that their trainees improved their job skills.
13. Eighty-five percent of the trainees and 89 percent of the supervisors believed that provision was made for adequate supervision and instruction.
14. Seventy-eight percent of the trainees thought OCAP helped them to better understand employer expectations.
15. Eighty-four percent of the supervisors felt that the trainees' productivity compensated for the time and effort invested in the training process.

16. Eighty-six percent of the supervisors believed their trainees benefitted from OCAP.
17. Eighty-five percent of the trainees perceive their OCAP experience as being valuable in finding employment.

Job-Search/Counselling

18. OCAP counselling was effective in assisting trainees in clarifying their career goals and improving their job-search techniques.
19. Only 10 percent of the OCAP graduates were still undecided about a definite career goal.
20. Almost 80 percent of the OCAP graduates will continue to view their OCAP occupational training area as related to their career goals.
21. Over 50 percent of the trainees felt that their job-search skills had improved as a result of their OCAP experience.

Outcome

22. Sixty-two percent of the OCAP trainees secured employment after they left OCAP.
23. Of the trainees who successfully secured employment, 74 percent were with the employer who provided the OCAP training.
24. Nineteen percent of the OCAP trainees returned to school after they left OCAP.
25. In all, almost 70 percent of the OCAP trainees either secured employment or returned to school. Only 17.5 percent of the trainees (186) will definitely not return to school and are not working.
26. Over 1,000 employers have been initiated into the concepts of training to Terminal Performance Objectives (TPOs), a new method of performance measurement utilized by OCAP.
27. Employers perceive OCAP as a means of recruiting and training competent, new workers.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY

The Ontario Career Action Program (OCAP) was conceived by the Ontario Government as one process for alleviating the growing youth unemployment problem. Premier Davis announced the program in August 1975 as "a means of providing socially useful and relevant work experience".

In the first year of OCAP's operation (1976-77) selected applicants, aged 16 to 24 inclusive, were placed in Ontario Government Ministry and Agency offices and in the colleges of applied arts and technology (CAATs). These training positions, or intern-stations, were for a maximum of 52 weeks, during which the trainee received a gross training allowance of \$100 per week. The 1976-77 program placed over 1,000 trainees and 60 percent found jobs or returned to school. The project was comprehensively evaluated¹ and some modifications were made for the next year's program.

In 1977-78, the maximum length of training was reduced to 26 weeks and a counselling component was added. Over 2,000 unemployed youth were exposed to this work experience and over 66 percent found jobs or returned to school.²

In January 1977, a 12-week pilot program was initiated, to place OCAP trainees in the private sector for their training. Though implemented on very short notice, over 70 percent of the trainees found jobs or returned to school.³

From August 1977 to March 1978, a full OCAP-in-Industry program was again set in the private sector. Fourteen CAATs assisted in co-ordinating the program, with over 1,000 employers and almost 1,600 unemployed youth participating for a maximum of 16 weeks training.⁴

¹D.C. Ahrens and H. Saint-Onge, OCAP: Phase II Evaluation. Toronto: Ministry of Colleges and Universities, (January 1979).

²D.C. Ahrens and J. Cornelius, OCAP-in-Government 1977-78 Evaluation. Toronto: Ministry of Colleges and Universities (March 1979).

³D.C. Ahrens and Dr. G. Lewis, OCAP-in-Industry, Pilot Program Evaluation. Toronto: Ministry of Colleges and Universities, (May 1977).

⁴At the time of writing, the Ontario Government has allocated funds for training over 1,500 unemployed youth in its ministries and almost 4,700 unemployed youth in the private sector in 1978-79. All training is now limited to a maximum of 16 weeks.

Elements of OCAP Training

Training positions are approved by the local CAAT OCAP Co-ordinator, who assists the employer in formulating a comprehensive training plan which delineates assignments, objectives, conditions and "realistic" entry requirements. The CAAT OCAP Co-ordinator then refers appropriate applications from unemployed youth to the employer for final consideration.

All training positions are to incorporate relevant work experience and job skill development, but must also reflect local employment vacancies, in order that the OCAP trainee will be in a position of strength when applying for jobs.

A job-search component, which may also include some elements of career clarification, has now become an integral feature of OCAP. The combination of relevant work experience, the acquisition of job skills and good work habits, and the development of sound job-search techniques has resulted in dramatically improved employability among the OCAP graduates. At the same time, OCAP has been effective in assisting employers to recruit and train new workers to help expand their business.

ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

OCAP is administered provincially from the Central Co-ordinating Unit, in the Industrial Training Branch of the Ministry of Education. The Central Co-ordinating Unit is responsible for establishing program procedures and principles and ensuring their adherence. The Unit liaises with the CAATs, other sections of the government, politicians, the media, the Federal Government, employers and unemployed youth. All forms and brochures were designed by the Central Co-ordinating Unit, which also designed and implemented this evaluation.

The CAATs are responsible for administering the program in their college areas, consistent with Ministry guidelines. The CAATs work directly with employers and unemployed youth by screening and advising applicants, approving training positions, monitoring the training process, counselling trainees and advising employers. Whenever appropriate, trainees or employers may be referred to the full resources of the CAATs.

The CAATs provide the training stipend directly to the trainees. The Ministry reimburses the CAATs for the full amount of the trainees' stipends, plus an administrative allowance. The program functions well by being decentralized, since the CAATs can best assess the local economy and respond to their community needs. Decentralization tends to humanize OCAP and the intended program flexibility allows each college some variation in implementing the program locally.

PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION

A comprehensive evaluation of the first full-scale OCAP-in-Industry program was planned and budgeted for from its inception, since the concepts of the original program were being expanded into the private sector.

The three questionnaires (trainee, supervisor and employer) were developed to collect diverse data which would provide meaningful feedback on the degree to which OCAP met its objectives, valuable information on the participants, identification of procedural and/or conceptual problems in the program and assistance to the OCAP administration in refining the program to make it more effective and efficient.

Wherever possible, the questionnaires were designed to be consistent with previous OCAP evaluations and other studies being conducted in the Ministry of Education. The questionnaires were subjected to initial pre-testing and were used only after extensive consultation and revisions were made. CAAT OCAP Co-ordinators administered the surveys following comprehensive delivery instructions and periodic briefing sessions from the Central Co-ordinating Unit to ensure consistency of administration.

The questionnaires were administered in person, whenever possible, though some were administered over the telephone. OCAP intended that each trainee, supervisor and employer be administered a questionnaire. Table 1 illustrates the sample derived from this evaluation. Respondents were not shown the range of possible answers. Rather, the OCAP Co-ordinators asked the question and then coded the most appropriate response.

All questionnaires were edited and post-coded by the Central Co-ordinating Unit. Key punching, programming and logical consistency were the responsibility of the Ministry's Information Resources Branch.

A large number of computer tabulations, cross-tabulations and correlation analyses were produced to serve as a data base for the analysis of the program.

The three questionnaires and the frequency of responses are printed in an appendix to this report.

Further analysis of almost any type can be easily carried out by computer on the study's Statistical Package for Social Services (SPSS) data file. Enquiries should be directed to the Ministry's Information Resources Branch.

TABLE 1
A COMPARISON OF EVALUATION SAMPLE SIZE AGAINST ACTUAL
NUMBERS OF TRAINEES, SUPERVISORS AND EMPLOYERS BY COLLEGE

<u>College</u>	<u>TRAINEE/SUPERVISOR</u>				<u>EMPLOYER</u>			
	<u>Total Population</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>% of Pop.</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Total Population</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>% of Pop.</u>	<u>Sample</u>
				<u>% of Total Sample</u>				<u>% of Total Sample</u>
Algonquin	39	4	10%	0.4%	34	18	53%	2.9%
Cambrian	114	101	86%	9.5%	75	58	77%	9.4%
Confederation	181	140	77%	13.2%	100	56	56%	9.1%
Fanshawe	142	97	68%	9.1%	93	77	83%	12.5%
Georgian	50	44	88%	4.1%	39	13	33%	2.1%
Humber	95	64	67%	6.0%	64	37	58%	6.0%
Lambton	55	51	93%	4.8%	39	39	100%	6.4%
Mohawk	76	56	74%	5.3%	43	12	28%	2.0%
Niagara	69	51	74%	4.8%	55	43	78%	7.0%
Northern	87	52	60%	4.9%	68	21	31%	3.4%
St. Clair	257	101	39%	9.5%	97	72	74%	11.7%
St. Lawrence	239	171	72%	16.1%	150	105	70%	17.1%
Sheridan	52	6	11%	0.6%	45	4	9%	0.7%
Sir Sandford Fleming	126	108	86%	10.2%	100	57	57%	9.3%
Invalid data	—	16	1%	1.5%	—	2	0.2%	0.3%
TOTAL	1,582	1,062	67%	100.0%	1,002	614	61%	100.0%

PERCEPTIONS OF THE TRAINEES AND THEIR SUPERVISORS

This chapter is derived from the trainee and supervisor questionnaires. Through a detailed analysis of the data collected from these sources, determination can be made of various demographic and other features of the trainees, reasons for their failing to find previous employment, assessment of their work experience, evaluation of the counselling and job-search components, relative success of trainees in securing employment or returning to school, general effectiveness of the program, and recommendations for program modifications.

This chapter will be divided into the following sections:

1. Input
2. Work Experience Component
3. Job-Search/Career Counselling Component
4. Output
5. Program Effectiveness

INPUT

The INPUT section will discuss the selection procedures and objectives, and discuss the composition of participating youth.

(1) Selection Process

(a) Recruitment

Trainees: Over 16,000 applications were received from unemployed youth for consideration to participate in OCAP. This represents about 10 percent of the Province's unemployed youth, aged 16 to 24. Candidates were recruited through Canada Employment and Immigration Commission (CEIC), directly by the CAATs, via newspaper and other media advertisements, by a brochure circulated to several hundred supermarket carousel locations, and by word of mouth and association.

All areas of the Province were proportionately represented, though there were some minor discrepancies. As the program generates more and more public awareness, the number of applicants will correspondingly rise. In the Province's smaller communities, general awareness of OCAP is already greater than elsewhere.

Employers: Over 1,000 employers participated in OCAP, which represents about 10 percent of the employer enquiries into the program (see Employer Participation In OCAP, p.40).

(b) Eligibility Criteria

Trainees: In order to meet the eligibility requirements, applicants had to:

- (i) be between the ages of 16 and 24 inclusive;
- (ii) be out of the educational system;
- (iii) be out of work and actively looking for work;
- (iv) never previously held full-time employment in the area of their occupational choice.

The CAAT OCAP Co-ordinator and the OCAP Supervisor (employer) had a shared responsibility to ensure that all criteria were met. OCAP records and data from this evaluation confirm that the criteria were adhered to.

Employers:

Approval for an OCAP position was not automatic upon receipt of enquiry. The OCAP Co-ordinator investigated the potential training location and only approved the position after determining that the training offered:

- (i) would be meaningful;
- (ii) had good prospects of leading to full-time employment;
- (iii) would be transferable;
- (iv) reflected a local labour need;
- (v) would conform to the program guidelines.

(c) Selection Procedures

All applicants were thoroughly screened by the CAATs. Most CAATs arranged personal interviews with the applicants in order to explain the program more fully, verify career goals, assess the applicant's potential and, in several instances, offer free seminars on effective job searching.

A pre-selection process consisted of matching the educational backgrounds, qualifications and the occupational preferences of eligible applicants with the requirements and terminal performance objectives (TPOs) of available training plans developed by approved employer-participants.

Suitable applicants were then briefed on the position by the CAAT OCAP Co-ordinator and referred to the supervisor for final consideration and selection. Most supervisors interviewed fewer than three applicants.

(d) Selection Parameters

(i) Age

Table 2 illustrates the age distribution of OCAP participants. The majority were in the 16-19 year range, which accounts for 58 percent of unemployed youth. The participants' mean age was 18.4 years. This is a significant change from previous years, when the average age was between 19 and 21 years. Thus, the OCAP-in-Industry program has adjusted to represent the larger concentration of unemployed youth.

TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF TRAINEES BY AGE

	<u>Age</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative %</u>
	16	40	3.8%	3.8%
	17	115	10.8%	14.6%
	18	256	24.1%	38.7%
	19	213	20.1%	58.8%
<hr/>				
Sub Total	16-19	624	58.8%	58.8%
<hr/>				
	20	139	13.1%	71.8%
	21	95	8.9%	80.8%
	22	79	7.4%	88.2%
	23	76	7.2%	95.4%
	24	49	4.6%	100.0%
<hr/>				
Sub Total	20-24	438	41.2%	41.2%
<hr/>				
	TOTAL	1,062	100.0%	100.0%

(ii) Education

Table 3 identifies the educational level of participants. Almost 70 percent had no post-secondary education, though 21 percent had attended a CAAT, and less than 12 percent had been registered at a university. The average education was just less than Grade 12. These figures are fairly consistent with previous evaluations.

(iii) Sex

Almost two-thirds (65.4 percent) of the participants were females and 34.6 percent were males. This is also consistent with previous years.

(iv) Unemployment Prior to OCAP

Table 4 illustrates the distribution of participants by length of unemployment prior to OCAP.

Almost 60 percent of the trainees were unemployed for three months or less before joining OCAP. Only five percent were unemployed for over a year.

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF TRAINEES BY FORMAL EDUCATION

<u>Trainees'</u> <u>Education</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative %</u>
Less than Grade 8	4	0.4%	0.4%
Completed Grade 8	11	1.0%	1.4%
Completed Grade 9	33	3.1%	4.5%
Completed Grade 10	93	8.8%	13.3%
Completed Grade 11	92	8.7%	21.9%
Completed Grade 12	409	38.5%	60.4%
Completed Grade 13	83	7.8%	68.2%
<hr/>			
SUB TOTAL SECONDARY	725	68.2%	68.2%
<hr/>			
Some CAAT	108	10.2%	78.4%
Completed CAAT	108	10.2%	88.6%
Some university	39	3.7%	92.3%
B.A., B.Sc.	56	5.3%	97.6%
M.A., B.Ed., M.Ed.	12	1.1%	98.7%
Some CAAT and some university	3	0.3%	98.9%
Some CAAT and Ph.D.	1	0.1%	99.0%
Completed CAAT, some university	1	0.1%	99.1%
Other professional degrees	9	0.8%	100.0%
<hr/>			
SUB TOTAL POST-SECONDARY	337	31.7%	31.7%
<hr/>			
TOTAL	1,062	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 4
TRAINEE DISTRIBUTION BY LENGTH OF UNEMPLOYMENT PRIOR TO OCAP

<u>Length of Unemployment Prior to OCAP</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative %</u>
Up to 3 months	622	58.6%	58.6%
4 to 6 months	262	24.7%	83.2%
7 to 9 months	81	7.6%	90.8%
10 to 12 months	38	3.6%	94.4%
13 to 18 months	35	3.3%	97.7%
19 to 24 months	10	0.9%	98.7%
Over 24 months	14	1.3%	100.0%
TOTAL	1,062	100.0%	100.0%

(v) Career Goals

Table 5 illustrates the degree to which OCAP successfully placed trainees in the occupational area of their choice. Whenever possible OCAP applicants were placed in training positions which corresponded with their career goals. Almost 25 percent of the trainees did not have clearly defined career goals prior to their OCAP work experience. Overall, OCAP was 79 percent successful in placing trainees in areas of their occupational choice. Further discussion of this subject is found later in this chapter.

TABLE 5

TRAINEES PLACED IN OCCUPATIONAL AREAS OF THEIR CAREER CHOICE PRIOR TO OCAP

<u>Occupational Area/Career Goal</u>	<u>Number With this Career Goal</u>	<u>Number and Percent Placed in Career-Oriented Training Position</u>	
Natural Resources	4	2	50.0%
Education	19	15	78.9%
Medicine and Health	53	43	81.1%
Secretarial, Stenographic, Clerical	295	257	87.1%
Automatic Data Processing	12	9	75.0%
Management and Entrepreneurial	20	12	60.0%
Economics, Finance, Accountancy	17	8	47.1%
Purchasing and Sales	99	88	88.9%
Life and Physical Sciences, Mathematics	5	3	60.0%
Engineering, Architecture	12	8	66.7%
Community Development, Social Work	37	23	62.2%
Administration of Justice	1	0	0.0%
Social and Behavioural Sciences	2	2	100.0%
Library, Museum, Archival Sciences	4	2	50.0%
Entertainment and Performing Arts	10	4	40.0%
Recreation and Sports	17	14	82.4%
Writing, Journalism, Translation	23	13	56.5%
Creative and Commercial Arts, Photography	31	18	58.1%
Personal and Community Protection	6	1	16.7%
Personal Care and Hospitality	23	20	87.0%
Cleaning of Buildings and Materials	6	5	83.3%
Mechanical, Electrical Construction and Repair Trades	92	77	83.7%
Printing and Communications Equipment	3	3	100.0%
Transportation, Delivery, Materials Handling	6	2	33.3%
Processing of Food and Beverages	5	3	60.0%
Production of Wearing Apparel	4	4	100.0%
Processing and Assembly of Goods and Materials	14	10	71.4%
SUB-TOTAL	820	646	78.7%
No Career Goals	242	---	---
TOTAL	1,062	646	60.8%

WORK EXPERIENCE COMPONENT

A basic philosophy of OCAP maintains that a major reason many youths cannot secure meaningful employment is that they lack work experience. This section will evaluate from the trainees' and supervisors' perspectives, OCAP's effectiveness in providing meaningful work experience. Each area of examination has been rated on a five-point scale, ranging from "very poor" to "very good", in order to offer a comprehensive evaluation of the various elements.

As Table 6 indicates, 77 percent of the trainees felt that OCAP offered better than "somewhat" meaningful work experience. Only four percent felt that their OCAP experience was "very poor".

TABLE 6
TRAINEES' ASSESSMENT OF THEIR WORK EXPERIENCE

<u>Rating</u>		<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative %</u>
Very good	5	577	54.3%	54.3%
	4	241	22.7%	77.0%
Somewhat	3	172	16.2%	93.2%
	2	24	2.3%	95.5%
Very poor	1	42	4.0%	99.4%
Don't know		6	0.6%	100.0%
TOTAL		1,062	100.0%	100.0%

Table 7 illustrates that almost 84 percent of the trainees felt that OCAP was effective in improving their job skills. Comparatively, almost 83 percent of the supervisors perceived that their trainees improved their job skills.

The reader should note the very strong congruence of trainees' and supervisors' assessments of the adequacy of supervision, as illustrated in Table 8. Eighty-five percent of the trainees stated that they received adequate supervision and instruction, while almost 89 percent of the supervisors believed that they provided the same.

TABLE 7
TRAINEES' AND SUPERVISORS' ASSESSMENTS OF IMPROVED JOB SKILLS

<u>Rating</u>		<u>TRAINEE</u>			<u>SUPERVISOR</u>		
		<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative %</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative %</u>
Very good	5	630	59.3%	59.3%	549	51.7%	51.7%
	4	260	24.5%	83.8%	330	31.1%	82.8%
Somewhat	3	130	12.2%	96.0%	130	12.2%	95.0%
	2	12	1.1%	97.2%	22	2.1%	97.1%
Not at all	1	27	2.5%	99.7%	16	1.5%	98.6%
Don't know		3	0.3%	100.0%	15	1.4%	100.0%
TOTAL		1,062	100.0%	100.0%	1,062	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 8
TRAINEES' AND SUPERVISORS' ASSESSMENTS OF SUPERVISION AND INSTRUCTION

<u>Rating</u>		<u>TRAINEE</u>			<u>SUPERVISOR</u>		
		<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative %</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative %</u>
Very good	5	627	59.0%	59.0%	649	61.1%	61.1%
	4	264	24.9%	83.9%	294	27.7%	88.8%
Somewhat	3	113	10.6%	94.5%	94	8.9%	97.6%
	2	27	2.5%	97.1%	13	1.2%	98.9%
Very poor	1	27	2.5%	99.6%	1	0.1%	99.0%
Don't know		4	0.4%	100.0%	11	1.0%	100.0%
TOTAL		1,062	100.0%	100.0%	1,062	100.0%	100.0%

Many youth approach employment with unrealistic attitudes and expectations. If OCAP can effectively clarify these factors, then it is contributing to greater youth employability and also to worker harmony. Almost 78 percent of the trainees felt that OCAP helped them better understand employer expectations. Likewise, very few trainees experienced a negative change in attitude about work, as a result of their OCAP experiences.

Sixty-eight percent of the supervisors believed that their trainees became more aware of their abilities and limitations while on OCAP, and 82 percent of the supervisors saw the overall quality of their trainee's performance as better than mediocre (see Appendix). Substantiating this, almost 84 percent of the supervisors believed that the trainee's productivity compensated for the time and resources invested in the training process.

Overall, 86 percent of the supervisors believed that their trainees "profited by his/her exposure to OCAP" and 85 percent of the trainees believed that their OCAP experience was or will be valuable in finding employment.

Thus, we can see that OCAP-in-Industry in 1977-78 has been very successful and effective in providing meaningful work experience.

JOB-SEARCH/CAREER COUNSELLING COMPONENT

Lack of proven work experience (including job specific skills) is one major factor contributing to youth unemployment. The other primary element in this problem area is a lack of clearly defined career goals and general ignorance of how to mount an effective job search. This section will examine these factors and assess the manner and degree in which OCAP was effective in providing meaningful assistance.¹

(1) Counselling

Only 36 percent (363) of the trainees had received some form of career counselling prior to OCAP and this experience was generally rated as mediocre or indifferent, as seen in Table 9. However, most trainees received counselling while on OCAP and the general value of this counselling is rated much higher, with the OCAP Co-ordinators and supervisors being the most effective (see Table 10).

OCAP counselling was most effective in providing a better understanding of the program, helping to build-up confidence and assisting in the job-search process.

¹ See also:

D.C. Ahrens and George Repar, Ontario Career Action Centres. Toronto: Ministry of Colleges and Universities, (February 1979).

D.C. Ahrens, R. Pletsh and A. Etherington, "Creating a Career" Evaluation. Toronto: Ministry of Colleges and Universities, (January 1979).

TABLE 9
CAREER COUNSELLING PRIOR TO OCAP AND ITS ASSESSED USEFULNESS^(a)

<u>Source of Counselling</u>	<u>USEFULNESS OF COUNSELLING</u>					<u>No.</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	
	<u>5</u> <u>Very Much</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u> <u>Somewhat</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u> <u>Not at All</u>		<u>Row</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Column</u> <u>%</u>
High school Counsellor	41 17.9%	39 17.0%	87 38%	29 12.7%	33 14.4%	229	100%	36.6%
CEIC Counsellor	25 16.9%	26 17.6%	52 35.1%	20 13.5%	25 16.9%	148	100%	23.7%
Family/friends	24 24.7%	22 22.7%	39 40.2%	4 4.1%	8 8.2%	97	100%	15.5%
College or univ. Counsellor	13 23.2%	15 26.8%	17 30.4%	8 14.3%	3 5.4%	56	100%	9.0%
High school course	11 27.5%	3 7.5%	18 45.0%	4 10.0%	4 10.0%	40	100%	6.4%
Private Counsellor	3 13.0%	2 8.7%	7 30.4%	5 21.7%	6 26.1%	23	100%	3.7%
College or univ. Placement Officer	0 0.0%	3 20.0%	7 46.7%	3 20.0%	2 13.3%	15	100%	2.4%
Other	7 41.2%	4 23.5%	5 29.4%	1 5.9%	0 0.0%	17	100%	2.7%
TOTAL ^(b)	124 19.8%	114 18.2%	232 37.1%	74 11.8%	81 13.0%	625 ^(a)	100%	100%

(a) 669 trainees (63%) did not receive any career counselling prior to OCAP.

(b) multiple answers acceptable.

TABLE 10
CAREER COUNSELLING WHILE ON OCAP AND ITS ASSESSED USEFULNESS

<u>Source of Counselling</u>	<u>USEFULNESS OF COUNSELLING</u>					<u>No.</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	
	<u>5</u> <u>Very Much</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u> <u>Somewhat</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u> <u>Not at All</u>		<u>Row</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Column</u> <u>%</u>
OCAP Co-ordinator	141 19.7%	168 23.5%	267 37.4%	71 9.9%	67 9.4%	714	100%	41.4%
OCAP Supervisor	210 33.7%	143 23.0%	197 31.6%	38 6.1%	44 7.1%	623	100%	36.1%
CEIC Counsellor	18 15.7%	15 13.0%	44 38.3%	12 10.4%	26 22.6%	115	100%	6.7%
Career Counselling Sessions	59 57.3%	32 31.1%	8 7.8%	1 1.0%	3 2.9%	103	100%	6.0%
College Placement Officer	18 26.5%	6 8.8%	32 47.1%	6 8.8%	6 8.8%	68	100%	3.9%
College Counsellor	8 12.1%	6 9.1%	42 63.6%	2 3.0%	8 12.1%	66	100%	3.8%
Co-workers	4 21.1%	8 42.1%	4 21.1%	1 5.3%	2 10.5%	19	100%	1.1%
Family/friends	3 37.5%	0 0.0%	5 62.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	8	100%	0.5%
Other	6 60.0%	3 30.0%	1 10.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10	100%	0.6%
TOTAL ^(a)	467 27.1%	381 22.1%	600 34.8%	131 7.6%	156 9.0%	1,726 ^(a)	100%	100%

(a) multiple answers acceptable.

Prior to OCAP, almost 74 percent of the trainees had a clear idea ("somewhat" or better) of their career goals, whereas after OCAP only 10 percent were still undecided about their future. The comparisons are shown in Table 11.

TABLE 11
COMPARISON OF CAREER GOAL AWARENESS PRIOR TO AND AFTER OCAP

		CLEAR IDEA OF CAREER GOAL BEFORE OCAP		CLEARER IDEA OF CAREER GOAL AFTER OCAP	
		<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Don't know		22	2.1%	34	3.2%
Not At All	1	220	20.7%	62	5.8%
	2	36	3.4%	11	1.0%
Somewhat	3	216	20.3%	112	10.5%
	4	198	18.6%	126	11.9%
Very Much	5	370	34.8%	298	28.1%
Same		-	-	419	39.5%

Table 12 identifies the desire of trainees to continue in the occupational areas of their OCAP training. Comparison with Table 5 verifies that the OCAP-experience has strengthened trainees' goals and assisted the career clarification process. Almost 80 percent of the trainees are committed to the occupational area of their training.

(2) Job Search

Prior to joining OCAP, 80 percent of the trainees submitted fewer than 25 job applications and over 55 percent submitted fewer than 10 (see Table 13).

Table 14 compares the number of applications submitted by trainees prior to joining OCAP, by the length of unemployment preceeding their OCAP involvement.

TABLE 12
COMPARISON OF FUTURE CAREER GOALS BY OCAP JOB ACTIVITY

<u>Occupational Area/Career Goal</u>	<u>OCAP TRAINING POSITIONS</u>	<u>POST-OCAP CAREER AREA</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Natural Resources	3	2	66.7%
Education	20	17	85.0%
Medicine and Health	51	42	82.4%
Secretarial, Stenographic, Clerical	370	272	73.5%
Automatic Data Processing	13	11	84.6%
Management and Entrepreneurial	23	16	69.6%
Economics, Finance, Accountancy	12	8	66.7%
Purchasing and Sales	192	112	58.3%
Life and Physical Science, Mathematics	8	4	50.0%
Engineering, Architecture	16	12	75.0%
Community Development, Social Work	31	26	83.9%
Administration of Justice	1	0	0.0%
Social and Behavioural Sciences	4	2	50.0%
Library, Museum, Archival Sciences	11	3	27.3%
Entertainment and Performing Arts	5	4	80.0%
Recreation and Sports	20	14	70.0%
Writing, Journalism, Translation	22	17	77.3%
Creative and Commercial Arts, Photography	35	26	74.3%
Personal and Community Protection	1	1	100.0%
Personal Care and Hospitality	26	19	73.1%
Cleaning of Buildings and Materials	19	10	52.6%
Mechanical, Electrical Construction and Repair Trades	114	90	78.9%
Printing and Communications Equipment	17	8	47.1%
Transportation, Delivery, Materials Handling	3	2	66.7%
Processing of Food and Beverages	9	5	55.6%
Production of Wearing Apparel	7	5	71.4%
Processing and Assembly of Goods and Materials	26	12	46.2%
SUB-TOTAL	1,062	740	69.7%
No Career Goals	—	105	—
TOTAL	1,062	845	79.6%

TABLE 13
APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED BY TRAINEES PRIOR TO OCAP

<u>Applications Submitted Prior to OCAP</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative %</u>
None	122	11.5%	11.5%
1 - 5	288	27.1%	38.6%
6 - 10	178	16.8%	55.4%
11 - 15	122	11.5%	66.8%
16 - 20	76	7.2%	74.0%
21 - 25	55	5.2%	79.2%
Over 26	189	17.8%	97.0%
Don't know	32	3.0%	100.0%

Table 15 compares the age of OCAP trainees with the number of applications they said they submitted in their job search prior to OCAP. For all ages, at least 50 percent of the trainees said they submitted fewer than 11 applications prior to joining OCAP, and for 16 year olds 70 percent submitted less than this number.

Fewer than 1 percent of the applications submitted to OCAP were accompanied by a resumé. Extensive individual counselling sessions suggest that most unemployed youth don't seem to be aware of what a resumé is, how it can be utilized and what an effective one should look like.

As Table 16 illustrates, only 3.4 percent of the trainees cited poor job-search techniques as a factor in their previous unemployment. Rather, the responses of most trainees (54 percent) identified lack of general work experience as the major reason they were previously unable to find employment.

TABLE 14: COMPARISON OF LENGTH OF UNEMPLOYMENT PRIOR TO OCAP BY NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED

Length of Unemployment Prior to OCAP											TOTAL Row	
	No.	Percent	Cumulative %	None	1 to 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	16 - 20	21 - 25	Over 26	Don't Know	No. Column %
Up to 3 months	98	15.6*	15.6%	209	119	55	28	23	73	17	622	---
				33.7%	19.2%	8.9%	4.5%	3.7%	11.8%	2.6%	---	---
				49.4%	68.5%	77.3%	81.8%	85.5%	97.3%	100.0%	58.6%	58.6%
4 to 6 months	13	5.0%	5.0%	55	37	41	31	22	56	7	262	---
				21.0%	14.1%	15.6%	11.8%	8.4%	21.4%	2.7%	---	---
				26.0%	40.1%	55.7%	67.6%	76.0%	97.3%	100.0%	24.7%	24.7%
7 to 9 months	3	3.7%	3.7%	11	9	14	12	7	21	4	81	---
				13.6%	11.1%	17.3%	14.8%	8.6%	25.9%	4.9%	---	---
				17.3%	28.4%	45.7%	60.5%	69.1%	95.1%	100.0%	7.6%	7.6%
10 to 12 months	3	7.9%	7.9%	5	5	2	3	1	16	3	38	---
				13.2%	13.2%	5.3%	7.9%	2.6%	42.1%	7.9%	---	---
				21.1%	34.2%	39.5%	47.4%	50.0%	92.1%	100.0%	3.6%	3.6%
13 to 18 months	3	8.6%	8.6%	3	5	6	1	1	15	1	35	---
				8.6%	14.3%	17.1%	2.9%	2.9%	42.9%	2.9%	---	---
				17.1%	31.4%	48.6%	51.4%	54.3%	97.1%	100.0%	3.3%	3.3%
19 to 24 months	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	2	1	0	0	6	0	10	---
				10.0%	20.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	0.0%	---	---
				10.0%	30.0%	40.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.9%	0.9%
Over 24 months	2	14.3%	14.3%	4	1	3	1	1	2	0	14	---
				28.6%	7.1%	21.4%	7.1%	7.1%	14.3%	0.0%	---	---
				42.9%	50.0%	71.4%	78.6%	85.7%	100.0%	100.0%	1.3%	1.3%
COLUMN TOTAL	122	11.5%	11.5%	288	178	122	76	55	189	32	1,062	---
				27.1%	16.8%	11.5%	7.2%	5.2%	17.8%	3.0%	---	---
				38.6%	55.4%	66.9%	74.0%	79.2%	97.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 15: A COMPARISON OF AGE OF TRAINEES BY NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED PRIOR TO OCAP

Age	None										Over 26	Don't Know	TOTAL Row No. Column %
	1 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	16 - 20	21 - 25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	
16	No. 4	17	7	5	1	5	2	41					
	Percent 10.0%	42.5%	17.5%	12.5%	2.5%	12.5%	4.8%						
	Cumulative % 10.0%	51.2%	68.3%	80.5%	82.9%	95.1%	100.0%	3.9%					
17	No. 18	32	24	15	8	6	2	115					
	Percent 15.7%	27.8%	20.9%	13.0%	7.0%	8.7%	1.7%						
	Cumulative % 15.7%	43.5%	64.3%	77.4%	84.3%	93.0%	100.0%	10.8%					
18	No. 23	81	44	31	17	14	6	255					
	Percent 9.0%	31.8%	17.3%	12.2%	6.7%	5.5%	2.4%						
	Cumulative % 9.0%	40.8%	58.0%	70.2%	76.9%	82.4%	100.0%	24.0%					
19	No. 24	38	43	29	16	12	8	213					
	Percent 11.3%	17.8%	20.2%	13.6%	7.5%	5.6%	3.8%						
	Cumulative % 11.3%	29.1%	49.3%	62.9%	70.4%	76.0%	100.0%	20.1%					
SUB-TOTAL 16-19	No. 69	168	118	80	42	32	18	624					
	Percent 11.1%	26.9%	18.9%	12.8%	6.7%	5.1%	2.8%						
	Cumulative % 11.1%	38.0%	56.9%	69.7%	76.4%	81.6%	100.0%	58.8%					
20	No. 13	40	20	18	15	10	3	139					
	Percent 9.4%	28.8%	14.4%	12.9%	10.8%	7.2%	2.2%						
	Cumulative % 9.4%	38.1%	52.5%	65.5%	76.3%	83.5%	100.0%	13.1%					
21	No. 10	27	14	10	7	3	3	95					
	Percent 10.5%	28.4%	14.7%	10.5%	7.4%	3.2%	3.2%						
	Cumulative % 10.5%	38.9%	53.7%	64.2%	71.6%	74.7%	100.0%	8.9%					
22	No. 13	19	12	6	3	6	5	79					
	Percent 16.5%	24.1%	15.2%	7.6%	3.8%	7.6%	6.3%						
	Cumulative % 16.5%	40.5%	55.7%	63.3%	67.1%	74.7%	100.0%	7.4%					
23	No. 6	22	10	6	6	4	2	76					
	Percent 7.9%	28.9%	13.2%	7.9%	7.9%	5.3%	2.6%						
	Cumulative % 7.9%	36.8%	50.0%	57.9%	65.8%	71.1%	100.0%	7.2%					
24	No. 11	12	4	2	3	0	1	49					
	Percent 22.4%	24.5%	8.2%	4.1%	6.1%	0.0%	2.0%						
	Cumulative % 22.4%	46.9%	55.1%	59.2%	65.3%	65.3%	100.0%	4.6%					
SUB-TOTAL 20-24	No. 53	120	60	42	34	23	14	438					
	Percent 12.1%	27.4%	13.7%	9.6%	7.8%	5.3%	3.2%						
	Cumulative % 12.1%	39.5%	53.2%	62.8%	70.5%	75.8%	100.0%	41.2%					
TOTAL	No. 122	288	178	122	76	55	32	1,062					
	Percent 11.5%	27.1%	16.8%	11.5%	7.2%	5.2%	3.0%						
	Cumulative % 11.5%	38.6%	55.4%	66.9%	74.0%	79.2%	100.0%	100.0%					

Supervisors (59.7 percent) seem to agree with trainees that lack of work experience was the single most significant factor in the trainees not being able to secure a job prior to their joining OCAP. However, over 15 percent of the supervisors also cited poor job-search techniques as a factor of their trainees' prior unemployment (see Table 16).

TABLE 16
A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT BY TRAINEES AND SUPERVISORS OF THE REASONS
WHY TRAINEES HAD FAILED TO FIND EMPLOYMENT PRIOR TO OCAP

<u>Reason</u>	<u>TRAINEES^(a)</u>		<u>SUPERVISORS^(a)</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Lack of general work experience	574	54.0%	634	59.7%
Lack of Canadian work experience	14	1.3%	21	2.0%
Lack of specific job skills	179	16.9%	291	27.4%
More qualified person selected	231	21.8%	172	16.2%
Too young	93	8.8%	130	12.2%
Under educated	66	6.2%	71	6.7%
Over educated	19	1.8%	10	0.9%
Poor job-search technique	36	3.4%	161	15.2%
Not hiring	394	37.1%	181	17.0%
Did not apply anywhere	64	6.0%	—	—
Sex or race discrimination	10	0.9%	5	0.5%
Physical or health problems	5	0.5%	12	1.1%
Poor attitude/motivation	—	—	78	7.3%
No clear career goals	—	—	11	1.1%
Don't know	58	5.5%	—	—
Other	18	1.7%	27	2.5%

(a) multiple answers acceptable

Most trainees were placed in OCAP as a result of good personality, personal appearance, and motivation, (see Table 17). These are important elements in an individual's job-search process. Similarly, Table 18 indicates that poor presentation of these important job-search components were the major factors why other applicants were not selected for OCAP.

TABLE 17
SUPERVISORS' REASONS FOR SELECTING OCAP TRAINEE(S)

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>No. (a)</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Good motivation/attitude	497	46.8%
Good personality	466	43.9%
Good personal appearance	427	40.2%
Compatibility with occupational preference	326	30.7%
Appropriate schooling	293	27.6%
Good communication skills	274	25.8%
Appropriate job skills	241	22.7%
Relevant work experience	95	8.9%
Age	47	4.4%
Felt we could offer meaningful training	40	3.8%
Good references	20	1.9%
Other	18	1.7%
Don't remember	7	0.7%

Seventy-three (73) percent of the trainees felt that OCAP helped them more than "somewhat" in developing better job-search skills (see Appendix). Through the counselling sessions offered to OCAP trainees, they became more aware of employer expectations (91 percent - "somewhat" or more), and how to develop and effectively utilize resumé's.

Trainees were asked to assess the assistance of CEIC in their job search prior to, and while on OCAP (see Table 19). Over 67 percent of the trainees indicated that they will probably continue to use the resources of this federal agency in their future job search.

TABLE 18
SUPERVISORS' REASONS FOR NOT SELECTING
REJECTED OCAP APPLICANTS

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>No. (a)</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Lack of motivation/poor attitude	202	19.0%
Poor communication skills	165	15.5%
Poor personal appearance	149	14.0%
Lack of job skills	143	13.5%
Incompatible personality	138	13.0%
Incompatible occupational preference	115	10.8%
Lack of work experience	68	6.4%
More qualified person selected	41	3.9%
Personal problems	39	3.7%
Too young	38	3.6%
Projected or anticipated poor work habits	12	1.1%
Transportation problem	12	1.1%
Education	10	0.9%
Other	15	1.4%
Don't remember	40	3.8%

(a) Multiple answers acceptable

We have demonstrated that OCAP effectively provides meaningful work experience and also assists in the development of sound job-search skills among its trainees. The recent re-introduction of "Creating a Career"¹ (a process of career clarification and job-search skill development) in Ontario will be highly recommended as an integral introduction to OCAP.

¹ D.C. Ahrens, R. Pletsh and A. Etherington, "Creating a Career" Evaluation. Toronto: Ministry of Colleges and Universities, (January 1979).

TABLE 19

A COMPARISON OF TRAINEES' PERCEPTIONS OF CANADA EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION
COMMISSION'S (CEIC) HELPFULNESS TO THEM PRIOR TO AND DURING OCAP

		<u>CEIC HELPFUL BEFORE OCAP</u>		<u>CEIC HELPFUL WHILE ON OCAP</u>	
		<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Did not use		88	8.3%	304	28.6%
Not at all	1	515	48.5%	493	46.4%
	2	125	11.8%	75	7.1%
Somewhat	3	192	18.1%	111	10.5%
	4	77	7.3%	38	3.6%
Very much	5	65	6.1%	41	3.9%

OUTPUT

By merit of their OCAP experience, 62 percent of the trainees were successful in securing employment (see Appendix). A further 7.4 percent of the trainees will be returning to school. Table 20 illustrates that the average salary from these post-OCAP full-time jobs is about \$135.00 per week. Eighty-four percent of the trainees found jobs in the private sector. Significantly, three of every four of these jobs are with the employer who provided the OCAP training (see Appendix). This fact underlines the suggestion that most employers perceive OCAP as a means of providing recruitment and training assistance (see Employer Participation in OCAP, p.40).

TABLE 20
TRAINEES' SALARIES FROM FULL TIME POST-OCAP JOBS

<u>Salary</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>% of Sub-total^(a)</u>	<u>Cumulative %^(a)</u>
Less than \$100/wk.	17	3.7%	3.7%
\$101 - \$110/wk.	63	13.7%	17.4%
\$111 - \$120/wk.	76	16.6%	34.0%
\$121 - \$130/wk.	87	19.0%	52.9%
\$131 - \$140/wk.	44	9.6%	62.5%
\$141 - \$150/wk.	58	12.6%	75.2%
\$151 - \$160/wk.	24	5.2%	80.4%
\$161 - \$170/wk.	13	2.8%	83.2%
\$171 - \$180/wk.	14	3.0%	86.3%
\$181 - \$190/wk.	8	1.7%	88.0%
\$191 - \$200/wk.	17	3.7%	91.7%
Over \$200/wk.	38	8.3%	100.0%
<hr/>			
SUB-TOTAL	459	100.0%	100.0%
<hr/>			
Don't know	100	--	--
Not applicable ^(b)	503	--	--
<hr/>			
TOTAL:	1,062	--	--

(a) Excludes "Don't know" and "Not applicable".

(b) Includes part-time employment, returning to school and no jobs.

TABLE 21
A COMPARISON OF OCAP OCCUPATIONAL ACTIVITY BY POST-OCAP EMPLOYMENT STATUS

OCAP Occupational Activity	FOUND EMPLOYMENT					RETURNING TO SCHOOL					TOTAL					
	Full-Time Permanent	Full-Time Temporary		Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Uncertain	No Job								
Natural Resources	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	3	0.3%
Education	6	30.0%	5	25.0%	4	20.0%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.0%	0	0.0%	20	1.9%
Medicine and Health	28	54.9%	7	13.7%	3	5.9%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	5	9.8%	7	13.7%	51	4.8%
Secretarial, Stenographic, Clerical	151	40.8%	39	10.5%	23	6.2%	14	3.8%	10	2.7%	47	12.7%	87	23.5%	370	34.8%
Automatic Data Processing	8	61.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	4	30.8%	0	0.0%	13	1.2%
Management and Entrepreneurial	14	60.9%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	1	4.3%	1	4.3%	3	13.0%	3	13.0%	23	2.2%
Economics, Finance, Accountancy	9	75.0%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	12	1.1%
Purchasing and Sales	83	43.2%	11	5.7%	35	18.2%	4	2.1%	2	1.0%	27	14.1%	30	15.6%	192	18.1%
Life and Physical Sciences, Mathematics	5	62.5%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	8	0.8%
Engineering, Architecture	7	43.8%	3	18.8%	0	0.0%	2	12.5%	1	6.3%	2	12.5%	1	6.3%	16	1.5%
Community Development, Social Work	6	19.4%	5	16.1%	5	16.1%	4	12.9%	1	3.2%	7	22.6%	3	9.7%	31	2.9%
Administration of Justice	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%
Social and Behavioural Sciences	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	4	0.4%
Library, Museum, Archival Sciences	2	18.2%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	3	27.3%	1	9.1%	2	18.2%	11	1.0%
Entertainment and Performing Arts	2	40.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	5	0.5%
Recreation and Sports	6	30.0%	1	5.0%	5	25.0%	2	10.0%	1	5.0%	2	10.0%	3	15.0%	20	1.9%
Writing, Journalism, Translation	8	36.4%	4	18.2%	2	9.1%	1	4.5%	0	0.0%	3	13.6%	4	18.2%	22	2.1%
Creative and Commercial Arts, Photography	18	51.4%	1	2.9%	3	8.6%	7	20.0%	0	0.0%	5	14.3%	1	2.9%	35	3.3%
Personal and Community Protection	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%
Personal Care and Hospitality	14	53.8%	2	7.7%	5	19.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.8%	4	15.4%	26	2.4%
Cleaning of Buildings and Materials	6	31.6%	1	5.3%	1	5.3%	2	10.5%	1	5.3%	1	5.3%	7	36.8%	19	1.8%
Mechanical, Electrical Construction and Repair Trades	57	50.0%	5	4.4%	5	4.4%	8	7.0%	3	2.6%	15	13.2%	21	18.4%	114	10.7%
Printing and Communications Equipment	13	76.5%	0	0.0%	2	11.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.9%	1	5.9%	17	1.6%
Transportation, Delivery, Materials Handling	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.3%
Processing of Food and Beverages	3	33.3%	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	33.3%	9	0.8%
Production of Wearing Apparel	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	3	42.9%	7	0.7%
Processing and Assembly of Goods and Materials	12	46.2%	3	11.5%	0	0.0%	2	7.7%	1	3.8%	4	15.4%	4	15.4%	26	2.4%
TOTAL:	462	43.5%	97	9.1%	98	9.2%	52	4.9%	27	2.5%	140	13.2%	186	17.5%	1,062	100.0%

* % = Row %

Table 22 reveals that trainees who solicited job-search assistance from their supervisors were generally more successful in finding post-OCAP employment. In fact, over 40 percent of those who failed to find a job by the completion of their training program did not solicit any assistance from their OCAP supervisor.

TABLE 22
A COMPARISON OF TRAINEES WHO SOLICITED JOB-SEARCH
ASSISTANCE FROM THEIR OCAP SUPERVISORS AND THEIR
POST-OCAP EMPLOYMENT STATUS

<u>Trainees</u> <u>Solicited</u> <u>Assistance</u>	<u>FOUND EMPLOYMENT</u>			<u>RETURNING TO SCHOOL</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>Full-Time</u> <u>Permanent</u>	<u>Full-Time</u> <u>Temporary</u>	<u>Part-</u> <u>Time</u>	<u>Full-</u> <u>Time</u>	<u>Part-</u> <u>Time</u>	<u>Uncer-</u> <u>tain</u>	<u>No</u> <u>Job</u>	<u>No.</u> <u>Col. %</u>
Very Much 5	98 51.9%	25 13.2%	19 10.1%	4 2.1%	4 2.1%	16 8.5%	23 12.2%	189 17.8%
4	83 37.9%	22 10.0%	25 11.4%	7 3.2%	6 2.7%	29 13.2%	47 21.5%	219 20.6%
Somewhat 3	78 42.6%	18 9.8%	17 9.3%	12 6.6%	3 1.6%	27 14.8%	28 15.3%	183 17.2%
2	28 41.2%	9 13.2%	5 7.4%	6 8.8%	4 5.9%	9 13.2%	7 10.3%	68 6.4%
Not at all 1	151 41.5%	22 6.0%	27 7.4%	22 6.0%	10 2.7%	57 15.7%	75 20.6%	364 34.3%
Don't know	24 61.5%	1 2.6%	5 12.8%	1 2.6%	0 0.0%	2 5.1%	6 15.4%	39 3.7%
<hr/>								
TOTAL:	462 43.5%	97 9.1%	98 9.2%	52 4.9%	27 2.5%	140 13.2%	186 17.5%	1,062 100.0%

* % = Row %

OCAP trainees in the 16 to 19 year range were less successful in finding post-OCAP employment (see Table 23). These facts, though not surprising, will necessitate some innovation in OCAP, so that this clientele can be more effectively served by the program. More comprehensive support services and counselling will have to be made available for the younger, less educated OCAP trainees.

Table 25 compares the trainees' means of support prior to OCAP with their post-OCAP employment status. It can be seen that the most successful trainees are those who were previously working full-time and had changed their career goals. Other trainees successful in the labour market were those who had previously supported themselves through part-time employment or savings.

Table 26 shows the trainees' means of support prior to OCAP with their corresponding means of support after OCAP. Considered together, OCAP trainees are more self-sufficient as a result of their OCAP experience. Only one-third of those who indicated unemployment insurance benefits as their major means of support prior to OCAP, cite that as their source of income after OCAP. Almost 60 percent of those who relied on their family and friends for support prior to OCAP will now be supporting themselves by the income from their new job.

Almost 20 percent of the trainees are planning to return to school full-time or part-time, in order to upgrade their education and qualifications or pick-up specific skills. In most cases, the decision to return to school was directly related to their OCAP work experience (see Appendix). It should also be noted that the trainees left the program in the winter and with most school courses commencing in the spring or fall, even more trainees may in fact have returned to school.

Table 27 demonstrates that those trainees without Post-Secondary education seem more likely to indicate that they would return to school after OCAP. Presumably, they have become more aware of entry level requirements, the need for accredited qualifications and job specific skills, and generally have become more realistic about the world-of-work.

TABLE 23
A COMPARISON OF TRAINEE'S AGE DISTRIBUTION BY POST-OCAP EMPLOYMENT STATUS

POST-OCAP EMPLOYMENT STATUS																	
		FOUND EMPLOYMENT					RETURNING TO SCHOOL										
Trainees' Age	Full-Time Permanent		Full-Time Temporary		Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Uncertain	No Job		TOTAL						
16	13	32.5%*	2	5.0%	2	5.0%	6	15.0%	1	2.5%	5	12.5%	11	27.5%	40	3.8%	
17	48	41.7%	5	4.3%	8	7.0%	9	7.8%	5	4.3%	14	12.2%	26	22.6%	115	10.8%	
18	105	41.2%	18	7.1%	28	11.0%	10	3.9%	5	2.0%	35	13.7%	54	21.2%	255	24.0%	
19	99	46.5%	20	9.4%	20	9.4%	16	7.5%	5	2.3%	25	11.7%	28	13.1%	213	20.1%	
Sub-total 16 - 19		265	42.5%	45	7.2%	58	9.3%	41	6.6%	16	2.6%	79	12.7%	119	19.1%	623	58.7%
20	51	36.7%	18	12.9%	11	7.9%	1	0.7%	5	3.6%	23	16.5%	30	21.6%	139	13.1%	
21	51	53.7%	9	9.5%	9	9.5%	2	2.1%	3	3.2%	12	12.6%	9	9.5%	95	8.9%	
22	41	51.9%	9	11.4%	7	8.9%	5	6.2%	0	0.0%	7	8.9%	10	12.7%	79	7.4%	
23	33	43.4%	9	11.8%	7	9.2%	0	0.0%	1	1.3%	13	17.1%	13	17.1%	76	7.2%	
24	21	42.9%	7	14.3%	6	12.2%	3	6.1%	2	4.1%	6	6.1%	5	10.2%	50	4.7%	
Sub-total 20 - 24		197	45.0%	52	11.8%	40	9.1%	11	2.5%	11	2.5%	61	13.9%	67	15.3%	439	41.3%
TOTAL:		462	43.5%	97	9.1%	98	9.2%	52	4.9%	27	2.5%	140	13.2%	186	17.5%	1,062	100.0%

* % = Row %

TABLE 24
A COMPARISON OF TRAINEES' EDUCATION DISTRIBUTION BY POST-OCAP EMPLOYMENT STATUS

POST-OCAP EMPLOYMENT STATUS								
Education	FOUND EMPLOYMENT			RETURNING TO SCHOOL				
	Full-Time Permanent	Full-Time Temporary	Part-time Employment	Full- Time	Part- Time	Uncer- tain	No Job	Total
Less Than Grade 8	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	2 50.0%	4 0.4%
Completed Grade 8	2 18.2%	0 0.0%	3 27.3%	3 27.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 27.3%	11 1.0%
Completed Grade 9	76 48.5%	2 6.1%	0 0.0%	5 15.2%	0 0.0%	5 15.2%	5 15.2%	33 3.1%
Completed Grade 10	34 36.6%	1 1.1%	8 8.6%	9 9.7%	4 4.3%	9 9.7%	28 30.1%	93 8.8%
Completed Grade 11	41 44.6%	4 4.3%	9 9.8%	2 2.2%	3 3.3%	19 20.7%	14 15.2%	92 8.7%
Completed Grade 12	470 41.9%	30 7.4%	37 9.1%	18 4.4%	12 3.0%	62 15.3%	77 19.0%	406 38.2%
Completed Grade 13	36 43.4%	14 16.9%	11 13.3%	5 6.0%	1 1.2%	7 8.4%	9 10.8%	83 7.8%
Some Community College	50 46.3%	13 12.0%	10 9.3%	4 3.7%	2 1.9%	11 10.2%	18 16.7%	108 10.2%
Completed C.C.	50 46.3%	19 17.6%	5 4.6%	2 1.9%	3 2.8%	12 11.1%	17 15.7%	108 10.2%
Some University	21 53.8%	3 12.8%	6 15.4%	1 2.6%	1 2.6%	4 10.3%	1 2.6%	39 3.7%
B.A., B.Sc.	25 44.6%	7 12.5%	6 10.7%	3 5.4%	1 1.8%	2 14.3%	5 10.7%	56 5.3%
M.A, B.Ed	6 50.0%	2 16.7%	2 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 8.3%	1 8.3%	12 1.1%
Some CAAT and Some University	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 0.3%
Some CAAT and Ph.D.	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 0.1%
Completed CAAT and Some University	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 0.1%
Other	6 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 8.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 8.3%	4 33.3%	12 1.1%
TOTAL No.	462	97	98	52	27	140	186	1,062
Percent	43.5%	9.1%	9.2%	4.9%	2.5%	13.2%	17.5%	100.0%

* % is row %

TABLE 25

A COMPARISON OF TRAINEE' MEANS OF SUPPORT PRIOR TO OCAP BY POST-OCAP EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Means of Support Prior to OCAP(a)	POST-OCAP EMPLOYMENT STATUS				RETURNING TO SCHOOL			
	FOUND EMPLOYMENT							
	Full-Time Permanent	Full-Time Temporary	Part-Time Employment	Full-Time	Part-Time	Uncertain	No Job	TOTAL
U.I.C.	65 41.9%*	20 12.9%	14 9.0%	4 2.6%	4 2.6%	15 9.7%	33 21.3%	155 11.6%
Welfare	7 29.2%	3 12.5%	3 12.5%	2 8.3%	1 4.2%	4 16.7%	4 16.7%	24 1.8%
Part-time employment	126 43.8%	33 11.5%	27 9.4%	13 4.5%	5 1.7%	39 13.5%	45 15.6%	288 21.6%
Full-time (b) employment	35 58.3%	7 11.7%	4 6.7%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	5 8.3%	8 13.3%	60 4.5%
Supported by family/friends	240 40.9%	43 7.3%	62 10.6%	34 5.8%	17 2.9%	84 14.3%	107 18.2%	587 44.1%
Own savings	97 51.1%	21 11.1%	18 9.5%	10 5.3%	5 2.6%	21 11.1%	18 9.5%	190 14.3%
Student Loan/ Retraining Allowance	4 36.4%	1 9.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 9.1%	3 27.3%	2 18.2%	11 0.8%
Other	8 47.1%	2 11.8%	0 0.0%	3 17.6%	0 0.0%	3 17.6%	1 5.9%	17 1.3%
COLUMN No.	582	130	128	67	33	174	218	1,332(a)
TOTAL Percent	43.7%	9.8%	9.6%	5.0%	2.5%	13.1%	16.4%	100.0%

(a) Multiple answers acceptable

(b) Changed career goals

* % is row %

TABLE 26

A COMPARISON OF TRAINEES' MEANS OF SUPPORT PRIOR TO AND AFTER OCAP

Means of Support Prior to OCAP	MEANS OF SUPPORT AFTER OCAP							ROW TOTAL NO. ---
	Salary From New Job	UIC	Welfare	Own Saving	Living With Family/Friends	WCB	Other	
UIC	95	54	1	21	18	0	0	155
	61.3%*	34.8%	0.6%	13.5%	11.6%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
Welfare	13	9	2	4	3	0	1	24
	54.2%	37.5%	8.3%	16.7%	12.5%	0.0%	4.2%	2.3%
Part-time employment	181	72	0	54	47	0	2	288
	62.8%	25.0%	0.0%	18.8%	16.3%	0.0%	0.7%	27.1%
Full-time employment	48	10	0	9	5	0	1	60
	80.0%	16.7%	0.0%	15.0%	8.3%	0.0%	1.7%	5.6%
Living with family/friends	332	153	3	85	170	1	2	587
	56.6%	26.1%	0.5%	14.5%	29.0%	0.2%	0.3%	55.3%
Own savings	133	27	0	54	29	0	2	190
	70.0%	14.2%	0.0%	28.4%	15.3%	0.0%	1.1%	17.9%
Student Loan/ Retraining Allowance	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	11
	45.5%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Other	10	0	1	0	2	1	4	17
	58.8%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	11.8%	5.9%	23.5%	1.6%
COLUMN	638	258	7	165	205	2	9	1,062
TOTAL	60.1%	24.3%	0.7%	15.5%	19.3%	0.2%	0.8%	100.0%

* % is row %

TABLE 27
A COMPARISON OF TRAINEES' PRIOR LEVEL OF EDUCATION
WITH FUTURE EDUCATIONAL PLANS

RETURNING TO SCHOOL					ROW TOTAL	
Trainees' Education	Full-Time	Part-Time	Uncertain	No.	COLUMN %	
Less than Grade 8	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	2 50.0%	4 0.4%	
Completed Grade 8	3 27.3%	0 0.0%	2 18.2%	6 54.5%	11 1.0%	
Completed Grade 9	5 15.2%	1 3.0%	8 24.2%	19 57.6%	33 3.1%	
Completed Grade 10	11 11.8%	11 11.8%	17 18.3%	54 58.1%	93 8.8%	
Completed Grade 11	3 3.3%	11 12.0%	27 29.3%	51 55.4%	92 8.7%	
Completed Grade 12	31 7.6%	36 8.9%	115 28.3%	224 55.2%	406 38.2%	
Completed Grade 13	16 19.3%	12 14.5%	20 24.1%	35 42.2%	83 7.8%	
SUB-TOTAL SECONDARY	69 9.6%	71 9.8%	191 26.5%	391 54.2%	722 68.0%	
Some CC	8 7.4%	16 14.8%	32 29.6%	52 48.1%	108 10.2%	
Completed CAAT	2 1.9%	14 13.0%	23 21.3%	69 63.9%	108 10.2%	
Some university	4 10.3%	6 15.4%	17 43.6%	12 30.8%	39 3.7%	
B.A. B.Sc.	5 8.9%	5 8.9%	22 39.3%	24 42.9%	56 5.3%	
M.A., B.Ed.	0 0.0%	3 25.0%	1 8.3%	8 66.7%	12 1.1%	
Some CAAT and some university	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	2 66.7%	3 0.3%	
Some CAAT and Ph.D.	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 0.1%	
Completed CAAT and some university	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 0.1%	
Other	0 0.0%	1 11.1%	2 13.9%	9 75.0%	12 1.1%	
SUB-TOTAL POST-SECONDARY	19 5.6%	46 13.5%	97 28.5%	178 52.4%	340 32.0%	
TOTAL	No. 88	117	288	569	1,062	
	Row %	8.3%	11.0%	27.1%	53.6%	100.0%

Finally, Table 28 compares the trainees' post-OCAP employment status with their plans to return to school. In total, almost 62 percent of the trainees secured employment and 20 percent of these trainees also have indicated that they will return to school. An additional 20 percent of those trainees who didn't secure employment will be returning to school. Only 17.5 percent of the trainees indicated that they definitely will not be returning to school or work. In all, almost 70 percent of the trainees secured employment or returned to school.

TABLE 28
A COMPARISON OF TRAINEES' POST-OCAP EMPLOYMENT STATUS
WITH THEIR PLANS TO RETURN TO SCHOOL

<u>Post-OCAP Employment Status</u>		<u>RETURNING TO SCHOOL</u>				<u>Row Total</u>
		<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Full-time permanent		18 3.9%*	65 14.1%	99 21.4%	280 60.6%	462 43.5%
Full-time temporary		7 7.2%	14 14.4%	19 19.6%	57 58.8%	97 9.1%
Part-time		11 11.2%	11 11.2%	30 30.6%	46 46.9%	98 9.2%
No job		52 12.8%	27 6.7%	140 34.6%	186 45.9%	405 38.1%
COLUMN NO.		88	117	288	569	1,062
TOTAL	Percent	8.3%	11.0%	27.1%	53.6%	100.0%

* % is row %

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

We have already illustrated that the vast majority of trainees favourably perceived the work experience and counselling components of OCAP (see Tables 6, 7, 8, 10 and Appendix). This is critical because 60 percent of the trainees said that the major reason for applying to OCAP was that the program provided needed job experience and 45 percent applied in order to get a job which interested them (see Table 29). OCAP appears to have been able to satisfy these needs, especially the former.

TABLE 29
TRAINEE'S REASONS FOR APPLYING TO OCAP

<u>Reason</u> ^(a)	<u>No.</u> ^(a)	<u>% of Sample</u> ^(b)	<u>% of Total No.</u> ^(a)
Provided needed work experience	637	60.0%	37.4%
Opportunity to get a job which was interesting	480	45.2%	28.2%
Could not get any job	380	35.8%	22.3%
Suggested by CEIC	98	9.2%	5.8%
Suggested by family, friend or counsellor	84	7.9%	4.9%
Suggested by employer	14	1.3%	0.8%
Sounded like a good program	3	0.3%	0.2%
Other	8	0.8%	0.5%
TOTAL:	1,704 ^(a)	160.5%	100.0%

(a) Multiple answers acceptable

(b) Sample is 1,062 trainees

At the end of the questionnaires, trainees and supervisors were asked if they would support OCAP. Almost 98 percent of the trainees said they would recommend OCAP to their friends and 97 percent of the supervisors said they would be receptive to training another OCAP trainee (see Appendix). These, clearly, are facts which speak for themselves.

The process of creating public awareness about OCAP appears to be satisfactory for this stage of the program's development, though a more concerted effort could obviously be made. However, the financial capacity of the program to accept and satisfy a reasonable percentage of applications from youth and employers must determine the scope of promotion. If a viable balance is not maintained, then the program will inevitably create frustrations due to its inability to meet rising expectations created by its publicity. Nonetheless, OCAP's reputation is growing among youth and employers throughout Ontario.

Recommendations for improving OCAP's effectiveness are presented in the final chapter.

EMPLOYERS PARTICIPATION IN OCAP

OCAP cannot effectively help alleviate youth unemployment, if the program is concerned solely with the needs of unemployed youth. For OCAP to maximize its effectiveness, the real and structural concerns of the Province's private sector must also be considered and viable mechanisms must be developed to strengthen Ontario's business and industry.

A major irony of the current high youth unemployment rates is in the dilemma faced by employers who maintain that they experience difficulty in recruiting good, competent employees. This was the second most frequently cited reason employers gave for participating in OCAP (see Table 30). Employers also emphasize that the costs of training new personnel are often too prohibitive. At the same time, Ontario has over 300,000 unemployed workers. These structural anomalies seem to be restricting a potentially vibrant economy from expanding, due to a manpower resource deficiency.

TABLE 30
EMPLOYERS' REASONS FOR PARTICIPATING IN OCAP

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>No. (a)</u>	<u>% of Sample (b)</u>	<u>% of Total No. (a)</u>
Felt we could offer meaningful training	349	56.8%	31.0%
Enable me to recruit competent, productive help	284	46.3%	25.2%
Needed help, but couldn't afford the starting wage	246	40.1%	21.9%
Help solve the unemployment problem	139	22.6%	12.4%
Sold on idea by OCAP recruiter	75	12.2%	6.7%
Friends had good experience with OCAP	29	4.7%	2.6%
TOTAL:	1,125^(a)	182.7%	100.0%

(a) Multiple answers acceptable

(b) Sample is 614 employers

As a society we seem to lack a viable mechanism for effectively bringing together employers and unemployed workers. One of the major contributions of OCAP-in-Industry is the development of just such a mechanism for youth. OCAP has successfully been able to assist hundreds of employers in recruiting and training competent manpower (most trainees who secured jobs got them with the employers who trained them) and has thereby directly stimulated Ontario's economy in a non-inflationary way.

Moreover, OCAP has primarily and intentionally dealt with small business and industry in the private sector. Recent statistics strongly indicate that 70 percent of the new jobs created in Ontario are with small business and industry.¹ In some instances, OCAP has been effective in assisting small business and industry to avoid bankruptcy. Such economic fortification helps to provide positive stimulation to the economy.

The statistics and analysis presented in this chapter represent the responses from 614 (61 percent) of the 1,002 participating employers (see Table 1). Table 31 illustrates that over 41 percent of the participating employers were engaged in some type of service operation. Another 30 percent of the employers were active in either wholesale or retail trade. This is disproportionate to the composition of the Ontario economy and a better balance will be of primary concern in OCAP's future. More emphasis must be placed on providing training assistance to the manufacturing sector. OCAP was able to engage only 13.5 percent of the participating employers from this sector. However, we should also note that Ontario appears to be evolving more and more into a service and communications economy, and perhaps requires greater stimulation to its manufacturing and processing sectors.

The vast majority (91 percent) of companies which participated in OCAP are not unionized (see Appendix). The size (number of employees) of participating companies has some bearing on this situation (two-thirds of the surveyed companies have 10 or fewer employees, see Table 32), as do union regulations which often place restrictions on the entry level and salary of

¹ Canadian Federation of Independent Business, Pre-Budget Submission to the Honourable Jean Cretien. Toronto: Canadian Federation of Independent Business, (October 1978).

TABLE 31
DISTRIBUTION OF OCAP TRAINING POSITIONS AMONG EMPLOYERS SURVEYED
AS COMPARED WITH THE ACTUAL COMPOSITION OF THE LABOUR FORCE
IN ONTARIO EMPLOYED

<u>Type of Business or Industry</u>	<u>SAMPLE</u>		<u>LABOUR FORCE</u> ^(a)	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No. (000's)</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Agricultural, Forestry Fishing	5	0.8%	128	3.4%
Mining	1	0.2%	57	1.5%
Construction	18	2.9%	230	6.1%
Manufacturing, Processing, Repair	83	13.5%	921	24.5%
Transportation, Communi- cations Utilities	12	2.0%	277	7.4%
Wholesale Trade	27	4.4%	624	16.6%
Retail Trade	156	24.4%		
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	35	5.7%	225	6.0%
Services	254	41.4%	1,169	31.0%
Other	23	3.8%	132	3.5%
TOTAL:	614	100.0%	3,762	100.0%

(a) The Labour Force, Cat. # 71-001, December 1977, Statistics Canada.

new employees or trainees. This effectively bars OCAP's involvement with many employers. General union approval and support in OCAP is a goal to pursue over the long term.

OCAP maintains that it is small business and industry in Ontario which most crucially needs recruitment and training assistance. Almost 80 percent of the participating employers had fewer than 25 employees, and less than nine percent had over 100 employees. The fact that 65 percent of the surveyed employers had 10 or fewer employees emphasizes the thrust of OCAP's involvement with small business and industry (see Table 32).

TABLE 32
DISTRIBUTION OF OCAP EMPLOYERS BY THE NUMBER
OF EMPLOYEES IN THE INTERVIEWED FIRMS

<u>Number of Employees</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Cumulative %</u>
None (a)	12	2.0%	2.0%
1 - 5	281	45.8%	47.8%
6 - 10	106	17.3%	65.0%
11 - 15	38	6.2%	71.2%
16 - 20	28	4.6%	75.8%
21 - 25	19	3.1%	78.9%
26 - 100	74	12.1%	90.9%
101 - 500	38	6.2%	97.1%
Over 500	16	2.6%	99.7%
Don't know	2	0.3%	100.0%
<hr/>			
TOTAL:	614	100.0%	100.0%

(a) Owner is the sole employee

Table 33 compares the type of business or industry by the size of the company.

TABLE 33: A COMPARISON OF TYPE OF BUSINESS OR INDUSTRY BY THE NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES

Type of Business	None	NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES							Over 500	Don't know	Row Total %
		1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-100	101-500			
Agricultural, Forestry Fishing	1 20.0%*	3 60.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 20.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 0.8%
Mining	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 0.2%
Construction	0 0.0%	6 33.3%	2 11.1%	1 5.6%	5 27.8%	1 5.6%	3 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	18 2.9%
Manufacturing, Processing	1 1.2%	27 32.5%	17 20.5%	6 7.2%	5 6.0%	3 3.6%	8 9.6%	10 12.0%	6 7.2%	0 0.0%	83 13.5%
Transportation Electricity	0 0.0%	3 25.0%	1 8.3%	2 16.7%	0 0.0%	2 16.7%	2 16.7%	2 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	12 2.0%
Wholesale Trade	0 0.0%	14 51.9%	5 18.5%	1 3.7%	2 7.4%	2 7.4%	3 11.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	27 4.4%
Retail Trade	3 1.9%	73 46.8%	31 19.9%	6 3.8%	7 4.5%	2 1.3%	29 18.6%	3 1.9%	2 1.3%	0 0.0%	156 25.4%
Finance Real Estate	1 2.9%	18 51.4%	7 20.0%	4 11.4%	0 0.0%	1 2.9%	2 5.7%	0 0.0%	2 5.7%	0 0.0%	35 5.7%
Services	6 2.4%	129 50.8%	43 16.9%	18 7.1%	9 3.5%	7 2.8%	20 7.9%	17 6.7%	4 1.6%	1 0.4%	254 41.4%
Other	0 0.0%	8 33.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 4.4%	6 27.0%	5 22.1%	2 9.0%	1 4.5%	23 3.8%
COLUMN NO.	12	281	106	38	28	19	74	38	16	2	614
TOTAL	2.0%	45.8%	17.3%	6.2%	4.6%	3.1%	12.1%	6.2%	2.6%	0.3%	100.0%

Table 34 illustrates that 59 percent of the participating employers hired between one and five new employees in the 12 months prior to being interviewed. Since they chose to participate in OCAP, we can reasonably assume that these companies have been either in a growth posture and/or have encountered a significant personnel turn-over problem. OCAP has effectively assisted these employers through co-operative participation in the training of new workers.

TABLE 34
DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES HIRED
BY OCAP EMPLOYER IN THE TWELVE MONTHS PRIOR TO BEING INTERVIEWED

	<u>No.</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Cumulative %</u>
None	79	12.9%	12.9%
1 - 5	363	59.1%	72.0%
6 - 10	47	7.7%	79.7%
11 - 15	20	3.3%	83.0%
16 - 20	8	1.3%	84.3%
Over 20	41	6.7%	91.0%
Don't know	5	9.0%	100.0%
<hr/>			
TOTAL	614	100.0%	100.0%

Table 35 reveals that almost 80 percent of the employers prefer to hire long term employees, who may require some training, rather than employees who are immediately productive, but may be short-term. However, without financial assistance for training, many employers are forced to recruit immediately productive workers (see Table 30). Thus, inexperienced people, most often youth, are at a definite disadvantage in securing jobs.

Half the employers did not utilize regular, formalized training programs prior to OCAP. Table 36 demonstrates that companies with more than eleven employees tend to have some sort of regular training programs to a greater degree than do companies with 10 or fewer employees.

TABLE 35
DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYERS' HIRING PREFERENCES

<u>Reason for Hiring</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Productivity from day one, even if employee might leave in six months	124	20.2%
Long term employees, who may require some training	487	79.3%
Don't know	47	7.7%
TOTAL:	614	100.0%

TABLE 36
A COMPARISON OF SIZE OF COMPANY BY PRESENCE
OF A REGULAR, FORMALIZED TRAINING PROGRAM PRIOR TO OCAP

<u>Have Regular Formalized Training Programs</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-5</u>	<u>6-10</u>	<u>11-15</u>	<u>16-20</u>	<u>21-25</u>	<u>26-100</u>	<u>101-500</u>	<u>Over 500</u>	<u>Don't know</u>	<u>Row Total ---- Percent</u>
Yes	2 0.7%*	119 40.8%	44 15.1%	24 8.2%	14 4.8%	10 3.4%	48 16.4%	18 6.2%	11 3.8%	2 0.7%	292 47.6%
No	9 3.0%	153 50.8%	58 19.3%	14 4.7%	14 4.7%	8 2.7%	23 7.6%	18 6.0%	4 1.3%	0 0.0%	301 49.0%
Part of the Company	1 5.3%	9 42.9%	4 19.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.3%	3 11.7%	2 10.5%	1 5.3%	0 0.0%	21 3.4%
COLUMN NO.	12	281	106	38	28	19	74	38	16	2	614
TOTAL	----										----
PERCENT	2.0%	45.8%	17.3%	6.2%	4.6%	3.1%	12.1%	6.2%	2.6%	0.3%	100.0%

* % is row %

Many employers seem to lack professionalism in the provision of training. OCAP's training strategy facilitates a learning process on the part of the employer. Through the introduction and effective use of training plans, monthly performance appraisals and regular communication, employers readily perceive the merits of training to specified terminal performance objectives (TPOs). Many CAATs have also provided short seminars on TPOs and instructional techniques for interested employers. An extension of this process could result in greater employer and community utilization of the CAATs resources and expertise.

Larger firms in business and industry in the private sector usually can absorb the cost of buying outside expertise or developing in-house training programs to upgrade their instructional personnel. Smaller firms may fail to recognize the need for such programs or cannot justify the initial expenditure.

OCAP, however, has been instrumental in upgrading the general instructional and training capacity of participating employers. This development is not limited merely to the short-term but, hopefully, is the initiation of a process which will continue to refine itself and reap positive long-term benefits. Ontario's CAATs should continue to encourage and support this process.

Direct employer-involvement in the selection of their OCAP trainee(s) supports the training process and substantiates the employers' involvement and commitment. To a large degree (91 percent), employers were directly involved in the trainee-selection process, because they understood the OCAP training process and recognized the importance of their involvement. In addition, 94 percent (see Appendix) of the employers said that they were well-informed and conversant with the philosophy and methodology of OCAP when they accepted a trainee. This awareness helped to avoid later misunderstandings and problems among the employer, the supervising CAAT and the trainee.

The various ways in which employers became aware of OCAP are illustrated in Table 37. The CAATs were the largest single means of disseminating information about the program (34 percent). Newspaper advertising was cited as a source by almost 20 percent of the employers and other forms of media and related usage by a further four percent. Almost

17 percent of the participating employers heard about OCAP from CEIC. Eleven percent of the employers were made aware of OCAP through their previous participation in the OCAP-in-Industry Pilot Program or by being informed by an unemployed youth (eight percent). However, the best promotion of OCAP should be one's experience and recommendation of it. In this regard, almost 25 percent of the employers heard about OCAP from their associates and friends. Such facts speak well for a new program.

TABLE 37
DISTRIBUTION OF SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT OCAP

<u>Source</u>	<u>No.</u> ^(a)	<u>% of Sample</u> ^(b)	<u>% of Total</u> ^(a)
CAAT	210	34.2%	31.2%
Associates/friends	150	24.4%	22.3%
Newspaper advertisement	121	19.7%	18.0%
Canada Employment and Immigration Commission (CEIC)	102	16.6%	15.1%
Unemployed youth	47	7.7%	7.0%
Had an OCAP trainee before	20	3.3%	3.0%
Ads, posters, placemats, etc.	17	2.8%	2.5%
Other media (radio, TV, etc.)	7	1.1%	1.0%
TOTAL:	674	109.8%	100.0%

(a) Multiple answers acceptable

(b) Sample is 614 employers

Employers participated in OCAP for a number of reasons. The most important stated reason, cited by almost 57 percent of the surveyed employers, was their belief that they could offer meaningful training (see Table 30). Combined with the almost 23 percent who indicated a desire to help in alleviating youth unemployment, most employers can be seen as being concerned with youth unemployment and committed to a co-operative role in helping to solve the problem. But, in this regard, only 25 percent thought that OCAP should be restructured on a cost-sharing basis. Table 38 identifies that companies with 11 - 100 employees are proportionally more amenable to a cost-shared arrangement. To small business and industry,

one of OCAPs biggest attractions is the absence of cash-flow problems related to the trainee and the minimization of corresponding government forms.

The magnitude of the youth unemployment problem and the difficulties faced by employers in recruiting, training and maintaining a competent and productive work force can both be reduced. The 46 percent of surveyed participating employers who looked at OCAP as a means of recruiting competent, productive help and the 40 percent who needed help but couldn't afford the starting wage (see Table 30), in addition to hundreds of unemployed youth, have clearly been assisted by OCAP.

Only 33 percent of the employers stated that they did not or will not hire their OCAP trainee(s). Over half (56 percent) have already hired their trainee(s) and another six percent said that they hope to do so. Table 39 compares the size of the companies with their intentions regarding their trainees' post-OCAP employment status.

In summary, OCAP can be seen as addressing itself to more than just the needs of Ontario's unemployed youth. OCAP has reached a limited number of small businesses and industries in the Province and has helped satisfy their needs too. OCAP has successfully involved the small employer in an on-the-job training experience, thereby upgrading the instructional skills of the private sector and providing participating employers with an opportunity to recruit and train new personnel at no direct cost to them. OCAP has effectively established a mechanism for bringing together employers and unemployed youth at least in a limited way.

TABLE 38

A COMPARISON OF SIZE OF COMPANY BY ASSESSMENT OF COST-SHARING REORGANIZATION

NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES

Should OCAP be Cost-Shared	None	NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES							Over 500	Don't know	Row Total No.
		1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-100	101-500			
Yes	1	68	29	16	9	5	23	3	4	1	159
	8.3%*	24.2%	27.4%	42.1%	32.1%	26.3%	31.1%	7.9%	25.0%	50.0%	25.9%
No	8	172	62	19	13	6	39	29	11	1	360
	66.7%	61.2%	58.5%	50.0%	46.4%	31.6%	52.7%	76.3%	68.8%	50.0%	58.6%
Don't know	3	41	15	3	6	8	12	6	1	0	95
	25.0%	14.6%	14.2%	7.9%	21.4%	42.1%	16.2%	15.8%	6.3%	0.0%	15.5%
COLUMN NO.	12	281	106	38	28	19	74	38	16	2	614
TOTAL PERCENT	2.0%	45.8%	17.3%	6.2%	4.6%	3.1%	12.1%	6.2%	2.6%	0.3%	100.0%

* % is column %.

TABLE 39
A COMPARISON OF SIZE OF COMPANY WITH INTENTIONS
TO HIRE OCAP TRAINEES

		PLAN TO HIRE OCAP TRAINEE(S)				Row Total No. ----
Number of Full-time Employees		Yes	Hope To	Don't Know	No.	Percent
None		3	2	0	7	12 ----
		25.0%*	16.7%	0.0%	58.3%	2.0%
1-5		125	19	19	118	281 ----
		44.5%	6.8%	6.8%	42.0%	45.8%
6-10		69	7	1	29	106 ----
		65.1%	6.6%	0.9%	27.4%	17.3%
11-15		27	1	2	8	38 ----
		71.1%	2.6%	5.3%	21.1%	6.2%
16-20		17	1	2	1	28 ----
		60.7%	3.6%	7.1%	3.6%	4.6%
21-25		13	1	0	5	19 ----
		68.4%	5.3%	0.0%	26.3%	3.1%
26-100		55	3	5	11	74 ----
		74.3%	4.1%	6.8%	14.9%	12.1%
101-500		23	1	0	14	38 ----
		60.5%	2.6%	0.0%	36.8%	6.2%
Over 500		12	1	0	3	16 ----
		75.0%	6.3%	0.0%	18.8%	2.6%
Don't know		1	0	0	1	2 ----
		50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.3%
COLUMN	NO. ----	345	36	29	204	614 ----
TOTAL	PERCENT	56.2%	5.9%	4.7%	33.2%	100.0%

* % is row %.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . All CAATs have become actively involved with OCAP in 1978-79, and employers and youth in all areas of the Province now have an opportunity to participate.
- . OCAP should continue to remain relatively flexible. The local CAAT OCAP Co-ordinators have demonstrated a very high degree of commitment and judgement. They should continue to maintain the responsibility for assessing local requirements and implementation.
- . A broader strategy should be developed and promoted to deal with Ontario's unemployed youth. Projects such as "Creating a Career" and the "Ontario Career Action Centres" should continue to be supported and expanded.
- . CAATs should continue to develop and offer Job-Search and Training-the-Trainer sessions.
- . OCAP should continue to assist small and developing business and industry.
- . More emphasis should be placed in training in the manufacturing sector. A recent linkage with the Apprenticeship Program should facilitate more technical and skilled training.
- . OCAP should continue to strengthen linkages with all community agencies, including service clubs, professional associations, CECs and all levels of government, education and industry.
- . OCAP should continue to administer the trainee's stipend directly thereby alleviating employer cash-flow and administrative problems.

APPENDIX

TRAINEE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

(Total N=1062)

1. Sex

Male	34.6%	(N=367)
Female	64.4%	(N=695)

2. How long were you unemployed and actively looking for work, before coming to OCAP?

Up to 3 months	58.6%	(N=622)
3 - 6 months	24.7%	(N=262)
6 - 9 months	7.6%	(N= 81)
9 - 12 months	3.6%	(N= 38)
12 - 18 months	3.3%	(N= 35)
18 - 24 months	0.9%	(N= 10)
Over 24 months	1.3%	(N= 14)

3. What kind of job were you doing on your OCAP placement?

Natural Resources	0.0%	(N= 3)
Education	2.0%	(N= 20)
Medicine and Health	5.0%	(N= 51)
Secretarial, Stenographic Clerical	35.0%	(N=370)
Automatic Data Processing	1.0%	(N= 13)
Management and Entrepreneurial	2.0%	(N= 23)
Economics, Finance, Accountancy	1.0%	(N= 12)
Purchasing and Sales	18.0%	(N=192)
Life and Physical Sciences, Mathematics	1.0%	(N= 8)
Engineering, Architecture	2.0%	(N= 16)
Community Development, Social Work	3.0%	(N= 31)
Administration of Justice	0.0%	(N= 1)
Social and Behavioural Sciences	0.0%	(N= 4)
Library, Museum, Archival Sciences	1.0%	(N= 11)
Entertainment and Performing Arts	0.0%	(N= 5)
Recreation and Sports	2.0%	(N= 20)
Writing, Journalism, Translation	2.0%	(N= 22)
Creative and Commercial Arts, Photography	3.0%	(N= 35)
Personal and Community Protection	0.0%	(N= 1)
Personal Care and Hospitality	2.0%	(N= 26)
Cleaning of Buildings and Materials	2.0%	(N= 19)
Mechanical, Electrical Construction and Repair Trades	11.0%	(N=114)
Transportation, Delivery, Materials Handling	0.0%	(N= 3)
Processing of Food and Beverages	1.0%	(N= 9)
Production of Wearing Apparel	1.0%	(N= 7)
Processing and Assembly of Goods and Materials	2.0%	(N= 26)
Printing and Communications Equipment	2.0%	(N= 17)

4. How long were you on OCAP?

Up to 2 weeks	1.8%	(N= 19)
2 to 4 weeks	3.5%	(N= 37)
4 to 6 weeks	2.6%	(N= 28)
6 to 8 weeks	4.0%	(N= 42)
8 to 10 weeks	2.5%	(N= 27)
10 to 12 weeks	4.6%	(N= 49)
12 to 14 weeks	5.6%	(N= 59)
14 to 16 weeks	75.2%	(N=799)

5. How old were you when you applied to OCAP?

16	3.8%	(N= 40)
17	10.8%	(N=115)
18	24.1%	(N=256)
19	20.1%	(N=213)
20	13.1%	(N=139)
21	8.9%	(N= 95)
22	7.4%	(N= 79)
23	7.2%	(N=76)
24	4.6%	(N= 49)

6. What is your highest attained level of education?

Less than Grade 8	0.4%	(N= 4)
Completed Grade 8	1.0%	(N= 11)
Completed Grade 9	3.1%	(N= 33)
Completed Grade 10	8.8%	(N= 93)
Completed Grade 11	8.7%	(N= 92)
Completed Grade 12	38.5%	(N=409)
Completed Grade 13	7.8%	(N= 83)
Some community college	10.2%	(N=108)
Completed community college	10.2%	(N=108)
Some university	3.7%	(N= 39)
Completed B.A., B.Sc.	5.3%	(N= 56)
Completed M.A., B.Ed., M.Ed.	1.1%	(N= 12)
Some community college and some university	0.3%	(N= 3)
Some community college and Ph.D.	0.1%	(N= 1)
Completed community college and some university	0.1%	(N= 1)
Other professional degrees	0.8%	(N= 9)

7. Before you joined OCAP how many applications did you submit for full-time jobs?

None	11.5%	(N=122)
1 - 5	27.1%	(N=288)
6 - 10	16.8%	(N=178)
11 - 15	11.5%	(N=122)
16 - 20	7.2%	(N= 76)
21 - 25	5.2%	(N= 55)
26 or more	17.8%	(N=189)
Don't know	3.0%	(N= 32)

8. How many were full-time jobs that you knew to be vacant?

None	36.0%	(N=382)
1 - 5	35.8%	(N=380)
6 - 10	8.7%	(N= 92)
11 - 15	4.5%	(N= 48)
16 - 20	2.0%	(N= 21)
21 - 25	1.1%	(N= 12)
26 or more	4.1%	(N= 44)
Don't know	7.6%	(N= 81)

9. What do you think were the major reasons why you did not get the job you most wanted? (multiple answers acceptable)

Lack of general work experience	54.0%	(N=574)
Not hiring	37.1%	(N=394)
More qualified person selected	21.8%	(N=231)
Lack of specific job skills	16.9%	(N=179)
Too young	8.8%	(N= 93)
Under-educated	6.2%	(N= 66)
Did not apply anywhere	6.0%	(N= 64)
Poor job-search technique	3.4%	(N= 36)
Over-educated	1.8%	(N= 19)
Lack of Canadian work experience	1.3%	(N= 14)
Sex discrimination	0.8%	(N= 9)
Physical or health problem	0.5%	(N= 5)
Race discrimination	0.1%	(N= 1)
Don't know	5.5%	(N= 58)
Other	1.7%	(N= 18)

10. How were you supporting yourself before coming on OCAP? (multiple answers acceptable)

Supported by family	55.3%	(N=587)
Part-time employment	27.1%	(N=288)
Savings	17.9%	(N=190)
U.I.C. Benefits	14.6%	(N=155)
Full-time employment	5.6%	(N= 60)
Welfare	2.3%	(N= 24)
Student Loan or Retraining Allowance	1.0%	(N= 11)
Other	1.6%	(N= 17)

11. How did you hear about OCAP? (multiple answers acceptable)

Canada Employment and Immigration Commission (CEIC)	40.4%	(N=429)
A friend	19.0%	(N=202)
An employer	18.5%	(N=197)
Newspaper advertisement	14.7%	(N=156)
Family	6.8%	(N= 72)
A teacher	3.7%	(N= 39)
College or OCAP Co-ordinator	3.0%	(N= 32)
Radio, TV, etc.	1.1%	(N= 12)
Other	1.7%	(N= 18)

12. What were your major reasons for applying to OCAP? (multiple answers acceptable)

Provided needed job experience	60.0%	(N=637)
Provided an opportunity to get a job which interested me	45.2%	(N=480)
Could not get any job	35.8%	(N=380)
Suggested by CEIC	9.2%	(N= 98)
Suggested by family, friend or counsellor	7.9%	(N= 84)
Suggested by employer	1.3%	(N= 14)
Sounded like a good program	0.3%	(N= 3)
Other	0.8%	(N= 8)

13. What were your major reasons for leaving OCAP? (multiple answers acceptable)

Contract expired	70.6%	(N=750)
Found employment	39.9%	(N=424)
Released by supervisor	4.9%	(N= 52)
Resigned -- work experience was not personally satisfying	2.3%	(N= 24)
Returning to school	1.3%	(N= 14)
Resigned -- work experience was irrelevant to personal career goals	1.2%	(N= 13)
Moved from area	1.2%	(N= 13)
Financial stress	1.1%	(N= 12)
Resigned -- conflict with supervisor	0.9%	(N= 10)
Health and/or family problems	0.7%	(N= 7)
Resigned -- work experience was irrelevant to finding full-time employment	0.5%	(N= 5)
Pregnancy	0.3%	(N= 3)
Got married	0.2%	(N= 2)
Other	0.4%	(N= 4)

14. Do you, or will you, have a job at the end of OCAP?

Yes, full-time permanent (Go to 15)	43.5%	(N=462)
Yes, full-time temporary	9.1%	(N= 97)
Yes, part-time (Go to 16)	9.2%	(N= 98)
No, not at all* (Go to 20)	38.1%	(N=405)
(* See question 23)		

15. How much money will you be making in your new job? (gross income)

Less than \$100/wk.	1.6%	(N= 17)
\$101 - \$110/wk.	5.9%	(N= 63)
\$111 - \$120/wk.	7.2%	(N= 76)
\$121 - \$130/wk.	8.2%	(N= 87)
\$131 - \$140/wk.	4.1%	(N= 44)
\$141 - \$150/wk.	5.5%	(N= 58)
\$151 - \$160/wk.	2.3%	(N= 24)
\$161 - \$170/wk.	1.2%	(N= 13)
\$171 - \$180/wk.	1.3%	(N= 14)
\$181 - \$190/wk.	0.8%	(N= 8)
\$191 - \$200/wk.	1.6%	(N= 17)
Over \$200/wk.	3.6%	(N= 38)
Don't know	9.3%	(N=100)
Not applicable	47.5%	(N=503)

16. Where will you be working in your new job?

Private sector	51.8%	(N=550)
Federal Government	2.7%	(N= 29)
Provincial Government	2.4%	(N= 26)
Municipal Government	2.4%	(N= 26)
Non-Government Agency	1.9%	(N= 20)
Self-employed	0.7%	(N= 7)
Not applicable	38.1%	(N=405)

17. Is your new job with the employer of your OCAP placement?

Yes	45.8%	(N=486)
No	16.1%	(N=171)
Not applicable	38.1%	(N=405)

18. Is your new job related to the work you were doing on your OCAP placement?

5 Very much	42.9%	(N=456)
4	4.5%	(N= 48)
3 Somewhat	6.1%	(N= 65)
2	0.8%	(N= 8)
1 Not at all	6.4%	(N= 68)
Don't know	1.2%	(N= 13)
Not applicable	38.1%	(N=405)

19. How long after leaving OCAP will your new job begin?

Up to 1 week	52.8%	(N=561)
Over 1 up to 2 weeks	3.4%	(N= 36)
Over 2 up to 3 weeks	1.0%	(N= 11)
Over 3 up to 4 weeks	0.7%	(N= 7)
Over 4 up to 5 weeks	0.1%	(N= 1)
Over 5 up to 6 weeks	0.4%	(N= 4)
Over 6 up to 7 weeks	0.2%	(N= 2)
Over 7 up to 8 weeks	0.4%	(N= 4)
More than 2 months	0.4%	(N= 4)
Don't know	2.3%	(N= 24)
Not applicable	38.1%	(N=405)

20. Are you actively seeking full-time work at the present time?

Yes	50.8%	(N=539)
No	49.2%	(N=523)

21. Are you available for full-time work at the present time?

Yes	57.8%	(N=614)
No	42.1%	(N=447)

22. Having left OCAP, what will your source of income be? (multiple answers acceptable)

Salary from new job	60.1%	(N=638)
U.I.C. Benefits	24.3%	(N=258)
Supported by family or friends	19.3%	(N=205)
Own savings	15.5%	(N=165)
Welfare	0.7%	(N= 7)
W.C.B.	0.2%	(N= 2)
Other	0.8%	(N= 9)

23. Do you plan to attend school?

Yes, full-time (Go to 24)	8.3%	(N= 88)
Yes, part-time	11.0%	(N=117)
Uncertain	27.1%	(N=288)
No, not at all (Go to 26)	53.4%	(N=567)

24. Why did you decide to return to school? (multiple answers acceptable)

To upgrade education/qualifications	12.4%	(N=132)
To pick-up specific job skills	8.5%	(N= 90)
Previous plans	2.7%	(N= 29)
Changed career goals	2.4%	(N= 26)
Could not find a job	1.4%	(N= 15)
Other	0.6%	(N= 6)
Not applicable	80.5%	(N=855)

25. What particular experiences most affected your decision to return to school? (multiple answers acceptable)

OCAP work experience	7.0%	(N= 74)
Discussions with family/friends	5.2%	(N= 55)
Discussions with OCAP supervisors	2.7%	(N= 29)
Previous plans	1.8%	(N= 19)
Non-OCAP counselling	1.2%	(N= 13)
Own decision	1.1%	(N= 12)
Discussions with OCAP Counsellor	1.0%	(N= 11)
Increase earning power	0.2%	(N= 2)
Don't know	1.0%	(N= 11)
Other	0.7%	(N= 7)
Not applicable	80.5%	(N=855)

26. Before you joined OCAP did you have a clear idea of the sort of job you wanted to be involved with on a long-term basis?

5 Very much	34.8%	(N=370)
4	18.6%	(N=198)
3 Somewhat	20.3%	(N=216)
2	3.4%	(N= 36)
1 Not at all	20.7%	(N=220)
Don't know	2.1%	(N= 22)

27. Do you now have a clearer idea of the sort of job you want to be involved with on a long-term basis?

Same	39.5%	(N=419)
5 Very much	28.1%	(N=298)
4	11.9%	(N=126)
3 Somewhat	10.5%	(N=112)
2	1.0%	(N= 11)
1 Not at all	5.8%	(N= 62)
Don't know	3.2%	(N= 34)

28. Before you joined OCAP did you ever have counselling to help you decide what type of work you might do on a long-term basis?

Yes	36.4%	(N=387)
No (Go to 30)	63.4%	(N=673)

29. Who did you get this counselling from? How valuable was it? (multiple answers acceptable)

Source	VALUE					Not A Source	Not Applicable
	<u>5</u> Very Much	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u> Somewhat	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u> Not at All		
High school Counsellor	3.9% N=41	3.7% N=39	8.2% N=87	2.7% N=29	3.1% N=33	15.4% N=164	63.0% N=669
CEIC Counsellor	2.4% N=25	2.4% N=26	4.9% N=52	1.9% N=20	2.4% N=25	23.0% N=244	63.0% N=669
Family/ friends	2.3% N=24	2.1% N=22	3.7% N=39	0.4% N=4	0.8% N=8	27.9% N=296	63.0% N=669
College or university Counsellor	1.2% N=13	1.4% N=15	1.6% N=17	0.8% N=8	0.3% N=3	31.7% N=337	63.0% N=669
High school course	1.0% N=11	0.3% N=3	1.7% N=18	0.4% N=4	0.4% N=4	33.2% N=353	63.0% N=669
Private Counsellor	0.3% N=3	0.2% N=2	0.7% N=7	0.5% N=5	0.6% N=6	34.8% N=370	63.0% N=669
College Placement Officer	0.4% N=4	0.3% N=3	0.7% N=7	0.3% N=3	0.2% N=2	35.2% N=374	63.0% N=669
Other	0.7% N=7	0.4% N=4	0.3% N=3	0.1% N=1	0.0% N=0	35.7% N=379	63.0% N=669

30. Who did you receive counselling from while on OCAP? How valuable was it? (multiple answers acceptable)

Source	VALUE						
	<u>5</u> Very Much	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u> Somewhat	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u> Not at All	Not A Source	Not Applicable
OCAP Co-ordinator	13.3% N=141	15.8% N=168	25.1% N=267	6.7% N=71	6.3% N=67	1.5% N=16	31.3% N=332
OCAP Supervisor	19.8% N=210	13.5% N=143	18.5% N=197	3.6% N=38	4.1% N=44	0.3% N=3	40.2% N=427
CEIC Counsellor	1.7% N=18	1.4% N=15	4.1% N=44	1.1% N=12	2.4% N=26	0.2% N=2	89.0% N=945
Job-Search Sessions	5.6% N=59	3.0% N=32	0.8% N=8	0.1% N=1	0.3% N=3	0.0% N=0	90.3% N=959
College Placement Officer	1.7% N=18	0.6% N=6	3.0% N=32	0.6% N=6	0.6% N=6	0.1% N=1	93.5% N=993
College Counsellor	0.8% N=8	0.6% N=6	4.0% N=42	0.2% N=2	0.8% N=8	0.2% N=2	93.6% N=994
Other	1.2% N=13	1.0% N=11	1.0% N=10	0.1% N=1	0.2% N=2	0.0% N=0	96.5% N=1025

31. What was helpful about the OCAP counselling? (multiple answers acceptable)

Better understanding of the OCAP program	46.6%	(N=495)
Helped build up confidence	40.1%	(N=426)
Assistance in developing job-search techniques	33.3%	(N=354)
Encouragement to seek jobs	31.9%	(N=339)
Helped improve relationship with supervisor	17.9%	(N=190)
Cleared up payroll problems	17.7%	(N=188)
Assistance with personal problems	4.2%	(N= 45)
Helped define career goals	1.9%	(N= 20)
Other	1.9%	(N= 20)

32. Did you find CEIC to be helpful in assisting your job-search before OCAP?

5 Very much	6.1%	(N= 65)
4	7.3%	(N= 77)
3 Somewhat	18.1%	(N=192)
2	11.8%	(N=125)
1 Not at all	48.5%	(N=515)
Did not use	8.2%	(N= 88)

33. Did you find CEIC to be helpful in assisting your job search while on OCAP?

5	Very much	3.9%	(N= 41)
4		3.6%	(N= 38)
3	Somewhat	10.5%	(N=111)
2		7.1%	(N= 75)
1	Not at all	46.4%	(N=493)
	Did not use	28.5%	(N=304)

34. Do you think that you will use CEIC in your future job-searching?

Yes	67.1%	(N=713)
No	12.1%	(N=128)
Don't know	20.8%	(N=221)

35. Do you think your supervisor properly understood the OCAP program?

5	Very much	53.2%	(N=565)
4		25.7%	(N=273)
3	Somewhat	12.2%	(N=130)
2		2.7%	(N= 29)
1	Not at all	2.3%	(N= 24)
	Don't know	3.9%	(N= 41)

36. Was your OCAP Supervisor a positive factor in your progress while on OCAP?

5	Very much	52.9%	(N=562)
4		23.5%	(N=250)
3	Somewhat	11.7%	(N=124)
2		3.9%	(N= 41)
1	Not at all	5.3%	(N= 56)
	Don't know	2.7%	(N= 29)

37. Did you receive adequate supervision/instruction at your OCAP placement?

5	Very much	59.0%	(N=627)
4		24.9%	(N=264)
3	Somewhat	10.6%	(N=113)
2		2.5%	(N= 27)
1	Not at all	2.5%	(N= 27)
	Don't know	0.4%	(N= 4)

38. Did you find the training plan to be a useful tool?

5	Very much	39.5%	(N=420)
4		25.7%	(N=273)
3	Somewhat	19.2%	(N=204)
2		4.6%	(N= 49)
1	Not at all	6.7%	(N= 71)
	Don't know	4.2%	(N= 45)

39. Do you think OCAP gave you the work experience you wanted?

5	Very much	54.3%	(N=577)
4		22.7%	(N=241)
3	Somewhat	16.2%	(N=172)
2		2.3%	(N= 24)
1	Not at all	4.0%	(N= 42)
	Don't know	0.6%	(N= 6)

40. Do you think OCAP has helped you improve your job skills?

5	Very much	59.3%	(N=630)
4		24.5%	(N=260)
3	Somewhat	12.2%	(N=130)
2		1.1%	(N= 12)
1	Not at all	2.5%	(N= 27)
	Don't know	0.3%	(N= 3)

41. Do you think your involvement with OCAP has helped you develop better job-hunting techniques?

5	Very much	27.9%	(N=296)
4		22.9%	(N=243)
3	Somewhat	22.1%	(N=235)
2		9.9%	(N=105)
1	Not at all	11.7%	(N=124)
	Don't know	5.6%	(N= 59)

42. Do you think your OCAP experience has helped you better understand what an employer expects from an employee?

5	Very much	47.9%	(N=509)
4		30.0%	(N=319)
3	Somewhat	13.0%	(N=138)
2		3.2%	(N= 34)
1	Not at all	4.8%	(N= 51)
	Don't know	1.0%	(N= 11)

43. Do you think your experience on OCAP was, or will be, valuable or important in getting a new job?

5	Very much	62.1%	(N=659)
4		22.9%	(N=243)
3	Somewhat	10.4%	(N=110)
2		2.0%	(N= 21)
1	Not at all	1.4%	(N= 15)
	Don't know	1.3%	(N= 14)

44. (a) Do you think OCAP has changed your attitudes about work?

5	Very much	22.4%	(N=238)
4		21.0%	(N=223)
3		17.6%	(N=187)
2		5.1%	(N= 54)
1	Not at all	31.2%	(N=331)
	Don't know	2.7%	(N= 29)

(b) If 2, 3, 4, or 5 -- Is this a positive change in attitude?

Yes	61.1%	(N=649)
No	1.2%	(N= 13)
Don't know	4.0%	(N= 43)
Not applicable	33.7%	(N=357)

45. Was the \$100.00 stipend adequate for your needs?

5 Very much	15.3%	(N=162)
4	26.2%	(N=278)
3 Somewhat	33.4%	(N=355)
2	10.4%	(N=110)
1 Not at all	14.8%	(N=157)

46. How long do you think the OCAP training period should be?

Less than 2 months	1.6%	(N= 17)
2 months	2.8%	(N= 30)
3 months	7.3%	(N= 77)
4 months	52.6%	(N=559)
5 months	7.4%	(N= 79)
6 months	20.4%	(N=217)
7 months	0.3%	(N= 3)
8 months	2.8%	(N= 30)
More than 8 months	4.7%	(N= 50)

47. Would you recommend OCAP to your friends?

Yes	98.0%	(N=1041)
No	2.0%	(N= 21)

48. Is there anything you would like to see improved or changed in the OCAP program? Any other comments? (multiple answers acceptable)

Good program	13.9%	(N=148)
Increase stipend	10.9%	(N=116)
More college contact	8.4%	(N= 89)
Vary length of training according to the position	7.3%	(N= 77)
More advertising and promotion	5.6%	(N= 59)
Improve payroll system	4.4%	(N= 47)
Employers should be better screened	2.6%	(N= 28)
Poor quality training	1.2%	(N= 13)
Clearer training program	1.1%	(N= 12)
Other	3.5%	(N= 37)

SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

(Total N=1062)

1. Were you directly involved in selecting this OCAP trainee?

Yes	942.0%	(N=88.7)
No	120.0%	(N=11.3)

2. How many applicants were interviewed for this position?

1	36.5%	(N=388)
2	12.2%	(N=130)
3	16.3%	(N=173)
4	10.7%	(N=114)
5	6.6%	(N= 70)
6	4.0%	(N= 43)
7	1.8%	(N= 19)
8	1.5%	(N= 16)
9	0.4%	(N= 4)
10	2.3%	(N= 24)
Over 10	2.2%	(N= 23)
Don't know	5.5%	(N= 58)

3. What were the major reasons why the rejected applicants were not selected? (multiple answers acceptable)

Lack of motivation/poor attitude	19.0%	(N=202)
Poor communication skills	15.5%	(N=165)
Poor personal appearance	14.0%	(N=149)
Lack of job skills	13.5%	(N=143)
Incompatible personality	13.0%	(N=138)
Incompatible occupational preference	10.8%	(N=115)
Lack of work experience	6.4%	(N= 68)
More qualified person selected	3.9%	(N= 41)
Personal problems	3.7%	(N= 39)
Too young	3.6%	(N= 38)
Transportation problem	1.1%	(N= 12)
Projected or anticipated poor work habits	1.1%	(N= 12)
Education	0.9%	(N= 10)
Don't remember	3.8%	(N= 40)
Other	1.4%	(N= 15)

4. What were the major reasons why this applicant was selected for this position? (multiple answers acceptable)

Good motivation/attitude	46.8%	(N=497)
Good personality	43.9%	(N=466)
Good personal appearance	40.2%	(N=427)
Compatibility of occupational preference	30.7%	(N=326)
Appropriate schooling	27.6%	(N=293)
Good communication skills	25.8%	(N=274)
Appropriate job skills	22.7%	(N=241)
Relevant work experience	8.9%	(N= 95)
Age	4.4%	(N= 47)
Felt we could offer meaningful training	3.8%	(N= 40)
Good reference	1.9%	(N= 20)
Other	1.7%	(N= 18)
Don't remember	0.7%	(N= 7)

5. What do you think were the major reasons this trainee was unable to find full-time employment prior to OCAP? (multiple answers acceptable)

Lack of general work experience	59.7%	(N=634)
Lack of specific job skills	27.4%	(N=291)
No jobs available	17.0%	(N=181)
More qualified person selected	16.2%	(N=172)
Poor job-search technique	15.2%	(N=161)
Too young	12.2%	(N=130)
Poor attitude/motivation	7.3%	(N= 78)
Under-educated	6.7%	(N= 71)
Lack of Canadian work experience	2.0%	(N= 21)
Physical or health problems	1.1%	(N= 12)
No clear career goals	1.0%	(N= 11)
Over-educated	0.9%	(N= 10)
Sex discrimination	0.5%	(N= 5)
Other	2.5%	(N= 27)

6. Do you perceive that this trainee became more aware of his/her abilities and limitations while on OCAP?

5 Very much	15.1%	(N=160)
4	52.9%	(N=562)
3 Somewhat	24.8%	(N=263)
2	2.1%	(N= 22)
1 Not at all	2.7%	(N= 29)
Don't know	2.4%	(N= 26)

7. To what extent were you able to provide adequate supervision/instruction for this trainee?

5 Very much	61.1%	(N=649)
4	27.7%	(N=294)
3 Somewhat	8.9%	(N= 94)
2	1.2%	(N= 13)
1 Not at all	0.1%	(N= 1)
Don't know	1.0%	(N= 11)

8. What was the overall quality of the trainee's performance?

5 Very good	52.4%	(N=557)
4	29.6%	(N=314)
3 Mediocre	12.5%	(N=133)
2	3.0%	(N= 32)
1 Very bad	1.3%	(N= 14)
Don't know	1.1%	(N= 12)

9. Do you feel that the time and resources which were invested in assisting this trainee were compensated for by his/her performance?

5 Very much	60.1%	(N=638)
4	23.7%	(N=252)
3 Somewhat	9.0%	(N= 96)
2	2.7%	(N= 29)
1 Not at all	2.9%	(N= 31)
Don't know	1.5%	(N= 16)

10. Did the trainee improve his/her job skills while on OCAP?

5	Very much	51.7%	(N=549)
4		31.1%	(N=330)
3	Somewhat	12.2%	(N=130)
2		2.1%	(N= 22)
1	Not at all	1.5%	(N= 16)
	Don't know	1.4%	(N= 15)

11. Did the trainee improve his/her work habits while on OCAP?

5	Very much	36.0%	(N=382)
4		29.1%	(N=309)
3	Somewhat	16.5%	(N=175)
2		4.2%	(N= 45)
1	Not at all	8.9%	(N= 95)
	Don't know	5.3%	(N= 56)

12. (a) Did the trainee change his/her attitudes about work while on OCAP?

5	Very much	14.6%	(N=155)
4		20.0%	(N=212)
3	Somewhat	21.8%	(N=231)
2		5.0%	(N= 53)
1	Not at all	28.9%	(N=307)
	Don't know	9.7%	(N=104)

(b) If 2, 3, 4 or 5 -- Was this a positive change in attitude?

Yes	57.3%	(N=609)
No	3.4%	(N= 36)
Not applicable	39.3%	(N=417)

13. Did the trainee solicit assistance from you in helping him/her gain full-time employment?

5	Very much	17.8%	(N=189)
4		20.6%	(N=219)
3	Somewhat	17.2%	(N=183)
2		6.4%	(N= 68)
1	Not at all	34.3%	(N=364)
	Don't know	3.7%	(N= 39)

14. Do you think this trainee profitted by his/her exposure in OCAP?

5	Very much	63.8%	(N=678)
4		22.1%	(N=235)
3	Somewhat	8.4%	(N= 89)
2		2.6%	(N= 28)
1	Not at all	1.4%	(N= 15)
	Don't know	1.6%	(N= 17)

15. Would you be receptive to training another trainee if OCAP was repeated?

Yes	97.4%	(N=1034)
No	2.6%	(N= 28)

16. Was the training plan an effective tool in assisting with this trainee's development?

5	Very much	37.4%	(N=397)
4		30.3%	(N=322)
3	Somewhat	20.2%	(N=215)
2		6.2%	(N= 66)
1	Not at all	3.5%	(N= 37)
	Don't know	2.4%	(N= 25)

EMPLOYER QUESTIONNAIRE

(Total N=614)

1. Type of Business or Industry.

Services	41.4%	(N=254)
Retail Trade	25.4%	(N=156)
Manufacturing, Processing and Repair	13.5%	(N= 83)
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	5.7%	(N= 35)
Wholesale Trade	4.4%	(N= 27)
Construction	2.9%	(N= 18)
Transportation and Public Utilities	2.0%	(N= 12)
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	0.8%	(N= 5)
Mining	0.2%	(N= 1)
Other	3.7%	(N= 23)

2. Is the section where the OCAP trainee(s) was placed unionized?

Yes	8.5%	(N= 52)
No	90.9%	(N=558)
Don't know	0.7%	(N= 4)

3. How many full-time employees work for this company?

None	2.0%	(N= 12)
1 - 5	45.8%	(N=281)
6 - 10	17.3%	(N=106)
11 - 15	6.2%	(N= 38)
16 - 20	4.6%	(N= 28)
21 - 25	3.1%	(N= 19)
26 - 100	12.1%	(N= 74)
101 - 500	6.2%	(N= 38)
Over 500	2.6%	(N= 16)
Don't know	0.3%	(N= 2)

4. How many people were hired in the last 12 months?

None	12.9%	(N= 79)
1 - 5	59.1%	(N=363)
6 - 10	7.7%	(N= 47)
11 - 15	3.3%	(N= 20)
16 - 20	1.3%	(N= 8)
Over 20	6.7%	(N= 41)
Don't know	9.0%	(N= 56)

5. Do you prefer to hire for ...

Productivity from day one, even if the employee might leave in six months	20.2%	(N=124)
Long term employees, who may require some training	79.3%	(N=487)
Don't know	7.5%	(N= 46)
Other	0.2%	(N= 1)

6. Do you have regular, formalized training programs?

Yes	47.6%	(N=292)
No	49.0%	(N=301)
Don't know	3.4%	(N= 21)

7. How would you describe the age profile of your employees?

Evenly distributed 18 - 65	22.5%	(N=138)
Evenly distributed 25 - 65	9.8%	(N= 60)
Predominantly under 35	27.2%	(N=167)
Predominantly over 35	4.2%	(N= 26)
Not applicable (i.e. - company with less than 5 employees)	34.4%	(N=211)
Don't know	1.9%	(N= 12)

8. How did you hear about OCAP? (multiple answers acceptable)

Community college	34.2%	(N=210)
Associates/friends	24.4%	(N=150)
Newspaper advertisement	19.7%	(N=121)
CEIC	16.6%	(N=102)
Unemployed youth	7.7%	(N= 47)
Had an OCAP trainee before	3.3%	(N= 20)
Ads, posters, placemats, etc.	2.8%	(N= 17)
Radio or television	1.1%	(N= 7)

9. Were you adequately informed about the philosophy and methodology of OCAP?

Yes	93.6%	(N=575)
No	3.9%	(N= 24)
Don't know	2.4%	(N= 15)

10. Were you directly involved in selecting your OCAP trainee(s)?

Yes	91.0%	(N=559)
No	9.0%	(N= 55)

11. Why did you participate in OCAP-in-Industry? (multiple answers acceptable)

Felt we could offer meaningful training	56.8%	(N=349)
Felt it would enable me to recruit competent, productive help	46.3%	(N=384)
Needed help, but couldn't afford starting wage	40.1%	(N=246)
Helping to solve the unemployment problem	22.6%	(N=139)
Was sold on idea by recruiter	12.2%	(N= 75)
Associates/friends had good experience with it	4.7%	(N= 29)

12. (a) Did you, or will you, hire your OCAP trainee(s)?

Yes	56.2%	(N=345)
Hope to	5.9%	(N= 36)
No	33.2%	(N=204)
Don't know	4.7%	(N= 29)

(b) If "Yes" or "Hope to" -- How many?

1	43.3%	(N=266)
2	8.8%	(N= 54)
3	2.3%	(N= 14)
4	0.2%	(N= 1)
5	0.7%	(N= 4)
6	0.2%	(N= 0)
7	0.0%	(N= 0)
8	0.0%	(N= 0)
9	0.0%	(N= 0)
10	0.2%	(N= 1)
More than 10	0.2%	(N= 1)
Don't know	6.7%	(N= 41)
Not applicable	37.6%	(N=231)

13. Do you think OCAP should be re-structured on a cost-sharing basis?

Yes	25.9%	(N=159)
No	58.9%	(N=360)
Don't know	15.5%	(N= 95)

14. Comments or suggestions.

Good program/expand the program	29.3%	(N=180)
Longer training period	8.8%	(N= 54)
Better matching/screening of applicants	7.2%	(N= 44)
More college contact	4.6%	(N= 28)
Increase stipend to trainees	2.4%	(N= 15)
Improve payroll system	1.6%	(N= 10)
More varied training	0.2%	(N= 1)

